KETNER, LINDA GAYLE. Homicide, Sex Role Differences and Role Relationships in North Carolina. (1975)
Directed by: Dr. John A. Humphrey. Pp. 149.

This study, based upon Palmer's theory of unreciprocity in role relationships, investigates similarities and differences between male and female homicide offenders, as well as between murderers and non-aggressive property offenders. Two independent variables are employed in the analysis: unreciprocity, or blockage in role relationships, and social role loss. It was hypothesized that as individuals' lives tend to be characterized by situations of high unreciprocity or role loss in relationships, the likelihood of outwardly directed violence, homicide, increases. It was further hypothesized that both male and female homicide offenders tend to experience in their lifetime similar degrees of unreciprocity and role loss.

The samples for this study were drawn from the population of North Carolina incarcerates serving sentences for first degree murder, second degree murder, or voluntary manslaughter and non-violent property offenses.

The violent sample consisted of sixty-one males and fifty-nine females randomly chosen from all inmates, over the age of sixteen, incarcerated for either first or second degree murder, or first degree manslaughter. The control sample consisted of sixty males and sixty females randomly chosen from all inmates incarcerated for property offenses, with no record of psychotic or aggressive behavior.

The data was drawn from North Carolina Combined Records. These records include psychiatric profiles, social histories, interviews with the inmates and members of their family and community.

Measures of unreciprocity and loss were compared in five major roles: the roles of child, student, employee, mate and parent. Objective measures of unreciprocity and loss were designed for each role and include such things as rejection, separation or dissertion by parents, alcoholism or addiction, infidelity on the part of a mate and delinquent children. Controls on age, education, occupation, marital status and race were introduced into the analysis.

Generally, the findings of the study were:

(1) High degrees of role unreciprocity were positively associated with homicidal behavior.

(2) High degrees of role loss were positively associated with homicidal behavior.

(3) High degrees of role unreciprocity were positively associated with female homicide in the roles of child, mate and parent. High degrees of role unreciprocity were positively associated with male homicide in the roles of student and employee.

(4) In general, high degrees of role loss were not associated with sex of the offender.

# HOMICIDE, SEX ROLE DIFFERENCES AND ROLE RELATIONSHIPS IN NORTH CAROLINA

by

Linda G. Ketner

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
1975

Approved by

John A. Humphrey

Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser John A. Humphrey

Oral Examination Committee Members Alvin H. Scaff

Jerry D. Cardwell

4-15-75
Date of Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The members of my thesis committee, Dr. John Humphrey, Dr. Jerry Cardwell, Dr. Alvin Scaff, are men for whom I have the deepest academic and personal respect. For the hours and interest of which they gave so freely, I wish to express my sincere appreciation. Special thanks are in order to Dr. John Humphrey, whose research provided the impetus for this study. His friendship, concern and counsel were of great personal value during my graduate education.

Dr. Jerry Cardwell's excellence in methodology was invaluable in the design of the research. Dr. Alvin Scaff's assistance with theoretical and stylistic clarifications was also appreciated. Carl Ballard, of the University's Academic Computing Center, was of great assistance in providing the statistical and computer skills for this study.

I would also like to thank Mr. Ben Baker and the staff of the North Carolina Combined Records Department for their cooperation and aid in the collection of data for this study. Without Mr. Baker's support, this study would not have been possible.

Finally, thanks to my friend, Mary Ellen Van Hout, who typed this manuscript despite her busy schedule. Her editorial help was of great assistance. Her friendship and support have been of immeasurable value to me for many years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Page

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

This research considers the social structural conditions which are associated with murder. Role relationships are examined in the lives of homicidal males and females, non-violent males and females. The five roles examined are the child, student, occupational, marital and parental roles. Two independent variables are analyzed: unreciprocity in role relationships and loss of role relationships.

The task at hand is to determine similarities and differences between murderers and non-aggressive criminal offenders; and, those similarities and differences between male and female murderers. It is hypothesized that those whose lives are characterized by severe role unreciprocity and loss are more likely to exhibit homicidal behavior. It is further posited that both males and females will have similar amounts of high level unreciprocity and loss.

This study was conducted in North Carolina during 1973-1974. The population under investigation was all North Carolina incarcerates serving sentences for first degree murder, second degree murder, first degree manslaughter; and individuals with no history of aggression serving sentences for property offenses. From this population, a sample of 61 homicidal males, 59 homicidal females, 60 non-violent males and 60 non-violent females were randomly selected.

The data for this study were drawn from North Carolina Combined Records. These records include social histories, psychiatric profiles, interviews with the offenders, relatives and associates.

This research follows the attendant format: Chapter Two provides a review of the literature on homicide. The theoretical orientation which acts as foundation for this study is explicated. Chapter Three outlines the major social structural dimensions of homicide. Chapter Four details the specifics of the research design. Chapter Five considers the independent variable, unreciprocity. Findings of the relationship between unreciprocity and murder are presented. Chapter Six deals with the independent variable, loss; findings between loss and murder are presented. Chapter Seven presents the summary and conclusions of the study, as well as pointing to the limitations of the research and suggesting future avenues of investigation. Finally, a bibliography on homicide and appendixed control tables are submitted.

# CHAPTER II

# THEORIES OF HOMICIDE

## A. Frustration-Aggression

Dollard and colleagues (1939) proposed a theory of frustration-aggression which postulated: (1) aggression is one possible consequence of frustration, and (2) the occurrence of aggressive behavior presupposes the existence of frustration, and (3) the intensity of aggression varies directly with the number of frustrations experienced. When individuals have experienced severe frustrations and have not been what Dollard expresses as "well socialized," they direct resultant aggression outwardly, homicidally, or assaultively, toward others.

Palmer (1960) and Gillin (1946) conducted studies on homicide offenders and their nearest age brothers which support the frustration-aggression hypothesis. Both men measured degrees of physical, psychological, and sociological frustration encountered by the homicide offenders. They found a significant relationship between severity of frustration experienced and proclivity toward outwardly-directed aggression, homicide.

Humphrey (1973) in a doctoral dissertation on inwardly and outwardly directed aggression also found evidence for support of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. His study compared the amount of frustration experienced by homicide offenders and New Hampshire Hospital mental patients with no record of violent behavior. The

results showed a significantly greater amount of highly frustrating life experiences among the homicide offenders.

Henry and Short (1954) investigated the frustration-aggression hypothesis in an attempt to ascertain psychological correlates of homicide. They were particularly interested in socialization experiences and types of punishment (whether physical or love-oriented) experienced by homicide offenders. They found that a group of homicide offenders received physical punishment much more often than a non-violent control group.

Gold (1958: 651-661) considered, in his study on the socialization of aggression, social class and the type of punishment administered by parents. He suggested that the lower-class parents employ physical punishment in punitive matters; while middle and upper class parents use forms of psychological control over their children. He found that males (enlisted men), rural residents, and blacks are more likely to experience physical punishment and subsequently direct their aggression outwardly. It is significant to note that lower class individuals, males, enlisted men, rural residents and blacks are among those most prone to homicide.

Wood (1961: 213-216) draws upon the frustration-aggression hypothesis in his formulation that homicide is closely related to thwarting of aspirations for upward social mobility. Homicide rates are considered from a social structural blockage perspective by Wood. He proposes that homicide rates increase as persons discover that the theoretical possibilities of upward mobility are inaccessible to them due to their low status position. Low prestige persons see

the situation as a lack of justice; having the opportunity to raise their status but being blocked from doing so. The concept of relative deprivation is an important consideration here; perceived injustice has a range as wide as individuals' meaning constructs, and as such crosses class lines in certain cases.

The frustration-aggression hypothesis has found its way into many of the following theories, either implicitly or explicitly; one of which is the Social Integration Theory which follows.

B. Social Integration

Henry and Short (1954) considered two variables in their social integration theory: first, external restraints, the degree to which individuals' behavior is required to conform to the demands of others; and second, strength of the relational system, the extent to which individuals are involved with others in close relationships. They hypothesized that the greater the external restraints in a group, the greater the strength of the relational system in that group and the higher the homicide rate. They state:

> A person of low status is required to conform to the demands and expectations of persons of higher status merely by virtue of his low status. A person involved in intense 'social' interaction with another person is required to conform to the demands and expectations imposed as a condition of that relationship . . . the strength of external restraint to which behavior is subjected varies directly with the strength of the relational system and inversely with positions in the status hierarchy (Henry and Short, 1954: 17).

Due to the imbalance of power in status positioning, Henry and Short imply those in the lower class suffer more frustration and are more likely to become homicide offenders. The extreme one-sided

restraints upon the lower statuses by the upper statuses mean a low level of integration of individuals into the social structure. Individuals in the lower classes then tend to blame others for frustrations, and subsequently direct their aggression outwardly.

Straus and Straus (1953: 461-469) suggest that an inverse relationship exists between homicide and the degree to which a society is closely structured (high social integration). When reciprocal rights and duties are stressed and enforced, a society is said to be closely structured. Straus and Straus maintain that outwardly directed behavior is not a culturally sanctioned solution to conflict in a closely structured society. Internalized norms may prevent individuals from directing their aggression outwardly when severe frustration occurs. However, in a society which does not stress reciprocal rights and duties, or a loosely structured society, homicide is less likely to be impermissable. Thus, Straus and Straus, like Henry and Short, suggest that homicide is a result of low social integration; though their argument of what constitutes a closely structured society runs counter to that of Henry and Short.

Lalli and Turner (1968: 191-200) speak to the question of a closely structured society also. They state that the more a society stresses customs, taboos, convention and ascribed statuses, the more likely there is to be a high incidence of homicide. This perspective is in agreement with the Henry and Short argument for the positive relationship between external restraints, close relational systems and outwardly directed aggression.

Porterfield (1948) developed a measure of "social well being" as an indicator of potential violent behavior. By indexing social

service facilities in the United States, he concluded that the lower the state's index of social well-being, the higher the rate of crime and homicide. If the needed services were not accessible to those individuals in need, the likelihood of outwardly directed aggression increased. In this sense, social well-being is a form of social integration: people collectively helping each other.

It is important to note that though there are disparities among those authors cited as to what constitutes high and low social integration, all agree that homicide occurs in the context of a society with low social integration.

C. Subculture of Violence Theories: Means, Goals, and Opportunities

While the following theories do not deal directly with homicide, their contribution to the general theory of homicide is of significance. The frustration, here experienced as structural blockage, leads deprived people into aggressive subcultures.

Merton (1957) specified Durkheim's definition of anomie to include the disparity between cultural goals and the institutionalized means for achieving those goals; the greater the disparity, the more anomic the society. Individuals who accept culturally approved goals, but who are blocked from legitimate institutionalized means for achieving them, may turn to criminal means to attain those goals. If the blockage induces severe frustration, homicide is a possibility. Once again, the frustration-aggression scheme is referenced.

Sutherland (1960) proposed that an individual is more likely to become criminal if he associates with others who have participated in a rule- or law-breaking subculture. This focus on differential

association was combined with Merton's anomie explication in Cohen's (1954) analysis of the delinquent subculture.

Cohen (1954) adds a psychological concept of reaction-formation to the formulation of Merton and Sutherland. This addition offers an explanation of how the criminal subculture develops. His reasoning is that:

> Lower-class boys in the United States internalize the prevailing cultural goals, which are set by the upper-middle class. But those boys are in large measure denied access to the institutionalized means for achieving these goals. The boys have a reaction-formation to these frustrating circumstances. They behave in ways which are diametrically opposed to the values of the upper-middle class. Thus, they lay the groundwork for, and go on to develop the customs, violent and otherwise, that constitute the delinquent subculture (Cohen, 1954: 64).

In middle-class boys, Cohen sees another form of reaction-formation operating, that of masculine protest. Middle-class mothers of sons may encourage feminine role behavior by stressing model behavior, rewarding passive, introverted behavior, and applying "good boy" labels. If this be the case, through reaction-formation, the boys may go to the opposite extreme to exhibit "tough guy" behavior. One way to affirm their masculine self-image may be theft or violent behavior.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) further build upon formulations by Merton and Sutherland, and with some disparity Cohen. Cloward and Ohlin accept the notion that lack of access to institutionalized means leading to culturally approved goals generate a delinquent subculture, but do not accept Cohen's reaction-formation explanation. They view the emergence of the delinquent subculture as a collective solution to the problem of disparity between means and goals. Depending upon the

type of lack an individual experiences, he may gain an illegitimate access to it according to his particular goals. An individual learns a role appropriate to that goal, and takes membership in one of three delinquent subcultures: the criminal (theft), the conflict (violence), and retreatist (the drug addict). Since older members of an already established subculture must accept the new member and teach the appropriate role behavior, the individuals's acceptance into the group carries with it socially designated labels, which assure his delinquent career.

Miller(1958: 5-19) offers a conflict orientation of his theory of the lower class delinquent subculture. He states that middle and upper-middle class values dominate the society and set the approved cultural sanctions for appropriate behaviors. The middle class has control of the agents responsible for maintaining their norms, and brings against the lower-class formal negative sanctions which in turn label them as deviant. In order to maintain a positive self-image, the delinquent is often forced into a criminal subculture for support; further widening the gap between aspirations and legitimate means for attaining them.

Sykes and Matza (1957: 664-70) maintain that lower class youths are in fact committed to middle-class values, rather than the two being in conflict as Miller suggests. Techniques of neutralization allow lower class individuals to transgress these norms and gain middle-class goals according to Sykes and Matza. In accomplishing middle-class goals, the lower-class youth may (if denied legitimate access) resort to illegitimate means. Because the illegitimate means run counter to the middle-class norms, the lower-class youth convinces himself that

the offense is justified; and in doing so, he is able to avoid labelling himself as deviant. These individuals rationalize that the infraction has not been violated with"criminal intent."

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) do not attempt to explain the subculture of violence; rather, they use the existence of the subculture as a starting place to explain the genesis of violent acts. They maintain that delinquent subcultures generate values which permit violence, and individuals who are highly integrated into the subculture are more likely to act highly violent.

Similar to this, Strodbeck and Short emphasized that threats to status of youthful gang members encourage violence. Short and Strodbeck (1965) point to the fact in adolescent gangs, higher status is maintained by domination. This domination often takes a violent form of expression in inter- and intra-gang fighting. Higher statused leaders maintain their positions by coercion, and the act of violence is a positively sanctioned behavior of gang membership.

D. Toward an Integration of Theories

Palmer has synthesized the previous formulations into a logically consistent theory based upon the concepts of role theory, social integration, social loss and frustration-aggression. Two concepts which he employs in effecting a synthesis of these formulations are role reciprocity and unreciprocity. Palmer states:

> Individuals hold statuses, that is positions at various points in the social system. They play out roles, they perform roles, in relation to these statuses--one role for one status. Others have expectations as to how they should perform these roles. Individuals are expected to act in certain ways when

> filling particular statuses. When playing given roles, it is their job, so to speak, to perform more or less in line with expectations. Generally, they are rewarded by others for doing so and frustrated for not doing so.
>
> Reciprocity enters in the following way: Individuals always play roles vis-a-vis other role-playing individuals. If expectations are performances for various roles played in relation to each other and such that there is mutual facilitation of performances toward meeting expectations, the role reciprocity is high. Role reciprocity is defined here, then as mutual facilitation of role-playing. Conversely, when expectations and performances for roles played in relation to each other involve mutual blockage of performances, then role unreciprocity is high.
>
> Role reciprocity and unreciprocity are, in supraindividual sense, useful measures of social integration. The more role unreciprocity, the lower the social integration. Excessive role unreciprocity suggests conflicts among individuals, frustration of attempts to perform, and the blaming of others who are unreciprocating. Here, outward-directed aggression--homicide, assault, so on--is held to be probable (Palmer, 1972b: 2-3).

According to Palmer (1970: 74) those who rebel fail to see themselves as a major source of frustration. Instead of blaming himself, the individual has two options available, he may "other-personalize," or blame other persons for his plight; or, he may "de-personalize" and blame the social structure in general for his ills. These two types of rebellion may be exemplified in the case of the rebel with a cause, and the rebel without a cause. The rebel with a cause blames the social-structure for his ills and strikes out at the system; the rebel without a cause blames other persons and strikes out at those he knows. In the latter case are many more homicide offenders who tend to murder those with whom they have much interaction.

Palmer (1972b) also discusses role loss, or social loss, as a major component of the theoretical formulation of homicide. He states:

> As we have said, a condition of low social integration tends to generate lethal aggression toward others. Loss of roles is likely to precipitate homicide to the degree that it decreases low social integration still further; and to the degree that the loss of roles is blamed upon others. If, on balance, role loss increases unreciprocity where there is already much unreciprocity, then the probability of homicide becomes greater. This will occur when the roles lost are those that provided some measure of reciprocity in an otherwise unreciprocating context.
>
> Conversely, if role loss decreases unreciprocity, then homicide will not tend to be precipitated. This obtains when roles involving much unreciprocity in the course of their performance are lost. As for blame, in situations of low integration and much unreciprocity, there is a definite tendency for others to be blamed: other individuals are generally perceived as blocking the given individual's performances and this extends to loss of role--although not always of course (Palmer, 1972b: 4-5).

The hypotheses derived from this theoretical position are as follows: (1) as individuals' lives tend to be characterized by severe unreciprocity, the likelihood of homicide increases; and (2) as individuals' lives tend to be characterized by severe role loss, the likelihood of homicide increases.

Palmer's approach is a situational one. It is generally accepted among social scientists that most of man's social behavior is situationally defined. In assessing one's own behavior, one takes into account the audience and the interaction situation itself.

Reciprocity, or unreciprocity, then takes place in a situationally defined parameter. Unreciprocity, therefore, is the extent to which performances of individuals in a situation block one another. Further, loss of social relationships, prestige, power and/or material goods has crucial etiological importance in the study of homicide.

In summary, the frustration-aggression hypothesis has been expanded and elaborated upon to include physical, psychological, and social frustrations, which have in turn, all been associated with violent behavior. The research has taken place on the individual and societal level in demonstrating the validity of the association between frustration and aggression. When an individual, or group, suffers frustration engendered by external blockage to preferred goals, that individual, or group, tends to direct aggression outwardly.

# CHAPTER III

## MAJOR DIMENSIONS OF HOMICIDE

Three types of legal convictions will constitute what shall be referred to as homicide. They are: First-degree murder, second-degree murder, and first-degree, or non-negligent, manslaughter.

### Geographical Differences

In 1960, the United States had a homicide rate of 4.5 per 100,000 population.* By 1972, the homicide rate has risen to 8.9 per 100,000, or almost doubled. There is great differentiation among regional homicide rates, with some regions having over four times the homicide rate of others. Table 1 indicates that in 1972, New England had the lowest homicide rate, 3.3, while the South Atlantic region had the highest homicide rate, 13.4. The state with the lowest rate in 1972 was South Dakota with 1.2 per 100,000 population; the largest being Georgia with a rate of 18.5. Of the top ranking state rates, the Southern region commands nine of the ten highest rates, Nevada being the only state outside the region. North Carolina with a rate of 12.8 per 100,000 population is sixth highest in the nation.

Disparity between goals and access to the means for achieving them is particularly accute in the South. Poor whites and blacks live in close proximity to the middle and upper classes, but suffer blockage to goals as well as denial of fundamental reciprocity. Despite

*Rates taken from the 1972 Uniform Crime Report unless stated otherwise

what Stuart Palmer (1972) refers to as a "growing superficial condescension" exhibited by whites toward blacks, there still exists a widespread attempt at blockage to blacks.

In South Dakota, the region with the lowest homicide rate, racial problems have not been significant, due in part to the relatively few blacks in that region. No outstanding claims to superior colonial lineage make for disparity. Competition and the pace of South Dakotians appears rather easy-going compared to the other areas of the country; all the above factors yielding considerable reciprocity in role relationships.

In the United States, homicide rates are highest among large cities with populations of 250,000 or more. In 1972, these cities had a crime rate of 19.7, while the rural areas rate was 5.5 and the suburban rate 3.4. It is logical to speculate that familial, educational, political and economic institutions are less reciprocating in the highly populated cities. One also could expect to find, to a lesser degree, similar blockage to goals experienced by the economically deprived in rural areas.

Table 2 shows the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area Rate for the nation, and Table 3 for North Carolina, as well as the Other Cities and Rural Categories. As can be seen by the tables, North Carolina's "Standard Metropolitan Area" rate is over one and one-half times greater than the national rate; North Carolina's "Other Cities" rate is over two and one-half times as great, and the Rural rate over one and two-fifths times as great as the national rate.

Concerning class differences in homicide rates, a study by Palmer (1965) illustrated fairly typical results. In a five-class hierarchy, homicidal offenders were over-represented in the lowest class by almost two to one, while being grossly under-represented in the higher classes.

Coser (1967), Henry and Short (1954) and Palmer (1960) studying a large number and variety of societies found that there is an inverse relationship between rates of criminal homicide and social class position of offenders and victims.

According to Palmer (1972), lower-class individuals are blocked from essentials--jobs, education, adequate housing, etc.: While upper-class individuals may be blocked from the luxury of choice as to which school he enters, what firm or corporation for which he desires to work. Lower class individuals are much more likely to react physically to institutionalized unreciprocity, while middle and upper classes resort to more verbal aggression. Regional area and social class are highly correlated with homicide, though not the only variables to be considered.

Racial Variations in Homicide Rates

In a study by Wolfgang, Kelly and Nolde (1962: 63-68), they found considerable discrimination against blacks in arrests for homicide. They found whites were less often convicted and blacks to be more often erroneously convicted for homicide. In 1972, blacks constituted 66% of the total homicide arrests. Comparing inner city ghetto blacks with suburban whites, Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) found the homicide rate fifty times higher for blacks than whites. The differential status

of blacks and whites, the lack of accessibility to culturally approved goals, the racial tensions between blacks and whites, all are consistent with the theories of frustration-aggression based on unreciprocity.

One traditional means to higher status is education. According to the Statistical Abstracts (1970), blacks have a 9.9 years of school completed mean, while whites have a 12.2 years mean. Fifty-five percent of the white population finishes high school as compared to thirty-four percent of the black population. Further, more than twice as many whites than blacks finish college. These educational differences contribute to the discrepancies found in occupational statuses.

Fifty-one percent of the white population are in white collar positions, while only two percent of the black population hold white collar jobs (Statistical Abstracts 1970). Accordingly, the economic status of blacks is much lower than that of whites. The median family income of blacks in 1969 was $6,191.00, while that of whites was $9,794.00 (Palmer 1972). There has been much press on the economic advancement made by blacks in the last few decades; however, their success is considerably less than whites. In 1947, the differential income of whites and blacks was $3,157.00; in 1969, the differential had increased to $3,603.00. In addition, in 1955, the unemployment rate of non-white males was 8.8 percent while the white rate was 3.7 percent. In 1970, the non-white rate had risen to 9.3 percent, while the white rate rose to 4.0 percent (Palmer 1972). In 1969, the percentage of non-whites living below the poverty level was 31.1 percent compared to the 9.5 percent figure of the white population. The vocal

defenses of blacks by some whites has apparently not affected the practical difficulties of blacks as much as one might think. The black population is still undereducated, underemployed and many are living at the poverty level and below. Blockage to goals of all sorts are typical to the black life experience.

Sex and Age

The Uniform Crime Report (1972) shows that 84.9 percent of all convicted homicide offenders are male; only 15.1 percent being female. In Palmer's (1972: 36-37) research on fifty-four non-literate societies around the world, he found male offenders predominating the homicide scene. Though in some societies, males and females were almost equal in the number of homicide offenses, in no case did female offenders dominate.

Durkheim (1951: 341-342) characterized women as "being less deeply involved in the struggle for life." Mable Elliott (1952: 200-201) stresses that "the average woman experiences less conflict between her ethical values (and mode of life) and the achievement of her goals than does the average man."

If the Womens' Liberation literature has been successful in drawing women toward more of the "struggles of life," one should expect an accompanying rise in the female crime rate. Nancy Wise (1967) found this to be true among middle-class girls. Chosing the middle-class girl because of the likelihood of her exposure to the Womens' Liberation propoganda, she measured the number of delinquent offenses and found a rise since the Womens' Movement among these girls. However, it does seem reasonable, at present, to argue that males in

the United States experience more competitive situations and unreciprocating interactions than do females.

Age is another important variable in homicide. The largest category of homicide offenders occurs in the twenty-five and under years of age bracket, as Table 4 shows. Seventeen percent are between the ages of 25 and 29, which is also quite large and indicates a longstanding pattern: Low homicide rates are found in childhood, very high rates are found in the early adult years, and a steady decline thereafter. According to Palmer (1972) this is a worldwide pattern.

The early adult life begins the time when individuals face the fact that the aspirations of adolescence will never materialize; that the goals they seek are unattainable. To the extent that the blocked individual perceives that others are responsible for his frustrations, he will direct his aggression outwardly, and in extreme cases, homicide is likely.

In summary, the Southern region of the United States has the highest national rate of homicide; New England region has the lowest. In terms of rural-urban rates, the highest is among central city areas. Race helps account for both the regional and rural-urban differences. The black population of the United States, which is concentrated in inner-city ghetto areas, has higher rates than the white population living in suburban areas.

Race is also associated with educational, economic, social and occupational, as well as class differences. As such, the blacks suffer severe blockage in the attainment of culturally approved goals.

Also important are the differences in male and female rates. Homicide offenders tend to be young adult males; at a time when their aspiration levels are high, they become aware of the imposed limitations of their horizons. Little is known about the female homicide offender. This study will hopefully contribute to an ignored area of homicide.

TABLE 1

1972 HOMICIDE RATE PER 100,000 POPULATION

BY REGION

| REGION | RATE |
|---|---|
| North East | 8.9 |
| Middle Atlantic | 8.5 |
| North Central | 7.3 |
| West North Central | 4.2 |
| South Atlantic | 13.4 |
| East South Central | 12.4 |
| West South Central | 11.6 |
| Mountain | 7.0 |
| Pacific | 7.9 |
| New England | 3.3 |

TABLE 2

1972 UNITED STATES HOMICIDE RATE PER 100,000

POPULATION BY STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA,

OTHER CITIES AND RURAL AREA RATES

| AREA | RATE |
|---|---|
| Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area | 9.9 |
| Other Cities | 5.1 |
| Rural Area | 7.4 |

TABLE 3

NORTH CAROLINA STATE HOMICIDE RATE PER 100,000 POPULATION BY STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA, OTHER CITIES, AND RURAL AREA RATES

| AREA | RATE |
|---|---|
| Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area | 15.0 |
| Other Cities | 13.7 |
| Rural Area | 10.2 |

# CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### Samples

The samples for this study were drawn from the population of North Carolina incarcerates serving sentences for first degree murder or manslaughter, second degree murder and non-violent property offenses.

The data for this study were drawn from North Carolina Combined Records. These records included psychiatric profiles, social histories, interviews with the inmates and members of their family and community. Psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and Probation Officers were responsible for providing a detailed account of the life history of each inmate. On the basis of their professionalism, it was felt that these data provided a sufficiently accurate and detailed account of the life history of each incarcerate.

Homicide Sample: The murder sample consisted of sixty-one males and fifty-nine females randomly chosen from all inmates, over the age of sixteen, incarcerated for either first or second degree murder, or first degree manslaughter.[1]

---

[1]"First degree murder entails taking the life of another while perpetrating or attempting to perpetrate any felony inherently dangerous to life; or with malice, premeditation, deliberation. The unlawful killing of a human being with malice, but without premeditation or deliberation, is murder in the Second Degree. Voluntary manslaughter is a killing of a human being in the heat of passion produced by great provocation, but without malice." (Snyder: 1974)

Non-Violent Comparison Sample: The comparison sample consisted of sixty males and sixty females rendomly chosen from all inmates incarcerated for property offenses, with no record of psychotic or aggressive behavior. All inmates who manifested significant forms of aggression at any points in their lives were rejected as sample members. All property offenders were actively serving sentences during March 1974 when the samples were drawn.

Description of the Samples

Age: Table 4, on the description of the samples with regard to age, shows that the non-violent sample tended to be younger than the homicide sample; 84.2 percent of the non-violent individuals were under 33 years of age compared to 60.9 percent of the homicidal individuals. Within the homicide sample, males tended to be younger than their female counterparts with 73.8 percent of male homicide offenders being 33 years of age or below, as compared to 47.4 percent of females 33 years of age or younger.

Education: The non-violent sample tended to be better educated than the homicide sample. While 35.8 percent of the non-violent group had completed high school, only 19.1 percent of the murderers had done so. Similarly, only 13.3 percent of the non-violent individuals had not completed at least the eighth grade, compared to 40.8 percent of the homicide offenders. Male homicide offenders tended to have higher percentages in both the highly educated and the lowly educated categories. Twenty-four and six-tenths percent of the male homicide sample are high school graduates or above, compared to 13.6 percent of the female homicide sample. However, 49.2 percent of the male homicide

TABLE 4

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES -- AGE

| | Homicides (Percent) | Non-Violent (Percent) | Male Homicides (Percent) | Female Homicides (Percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 5.1 |
| 46-51 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 8.5 |
| 40-45 | 9.2 | 2.5 | 8.2 | 10.2 |
| 34-39 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 11.5 | 28.8 |
| 28-33 | 21.7 | 10.0 | 24.6 | 18.6 |
| 22-27 | 24.2 | 36.7 | 29.5 | 18.6 |
| 16-21 | 15.0 | 37.5 | 19.7 | 10.2 |

TABLE 5

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES -- EDUCATION

| | Homicides (Percent) | Non-Violent (Percent) | Male Homicides (Percent) | Female Homicides (Percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Graduate School, minimum one year completed | .8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| College Graduate | .8 | .8 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| College, 1 to 3 years completed | 5.0 | 5.8 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| Technical School | 3.3 | 2.5 | 6.6 | 0.0 |
| High School Graduate | 9.2 | 26.7 | 11.5 | 6.8 |
| 8 to 11 Grades Completed | 40.0 | 50.8 | 26.2 | 54.2 |
| 1 to 7 Grades Completed | 38.3 | 13.3 | 45.9 | 30.5 |
| No Formal Education | 2.5 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 1.7 |

TABLE 6

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES -- OCCUPATION

| | Homicides (Percent) | Non-Violent (Percent) | Male Homicides (Percent) | Female Homicides (Percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professional and Technical | 1.7 | .8 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| Managers, Officers, Proprietors | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 3.4 |
| Clerical, Sales, Skilled Craftsmen, Foremen, Enlisted Military | 20.0 | 24.2 | 24.6 | 15.3 |
| Unskilled | 42.5 | 59.2 | 44.3 | 40.7 |
| Farm Laborers | 10.8 | 1.7 | 14.8 | 6.8 |
| Domestic Workers | 8.3 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 11.9 |
| Illegal Occupations | 1.7 | .8 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| No Occupation | 10.8 | 7.5 | 3.3 | 18.6 |

TABLE 7

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES -- MARITAL STATUS

| | Homicides (Percent) | Non-Violent (Percent) | Male Homicides (Percent) | Female Homicides (Percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unknown | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Married | 28.3 | 25.0 | 32.8 | 23.7 |
| Single | 20.8 | 42.5 | 23.0 | 18.6 |
| Widowed | 19.2 | 2.5 | 14.8 | 23.7 |
| Divorced | 9.2 | 15.0 | 9.8 | 8.5 |
| Other (May Include Separated) | 20.8 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 23.7 |

TABLE 8

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES

RACE

| | Homicides (Percent) | Non-Violent (Percent) | Male Homicides (Percent) | Female Homicides (Percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-White | 62.5 | 46.7 | 44.3 | 69.5 |
| White | 37.5 | 53.3 | 55.7 | 30.5 |

group did not complete eight grades of school, while only 32.2 percent of the female homicide sample were in this low category.

Occupation: There seemed to be little difference between the homicide and non-violent groups with regard to high and low occupations. Twenty-five and nine-tenths percent of the homicide sample held professional, managerial and clerical occupations as compared to 29.2 percent of the non-violent sample. While 18.6 percent of the female murderers, compared to 3.3 percent of the male murderers, had no occupation, in general, male and female murderers showed little difference in occupational distribution. Twenty-nine and five-tenths percent of the male homicide offenders had professional, managerial and clerical positions, compared to 22.1 percent of the females.

Marital Status: More of the non-violent sample members were single, compared to the homicide offenders. Similar percents of both the homicide sample and non-violent sample were married and divorced. Nineteen and two-tenths percent of the homicide sample were in the widowed category, compared to 2.5 percent of the non-violent sample. There was relatively little difference between male and female homicide offenders with regard to marital status. Slightly more male than female homicide offenders were married; slightly more female than male homicide offenders were widowed.

Race: Sixty-two and five-tenths percent of the homicide sample was non-white, compared to 46.7 percent of the non-violent sample. All of the non-white members were Black Americans, with the exception of seven American Indians in the homicide sample. The female homicide sample had considerably more non-white members than the male homicide group,

69.5 percent compared to 44.3 percent. Within the non-white homicide samples, all were Black Americans with the exception of three female American Indians and four male American Indians.

Summary

The homicide sample tended to be older, less educated, non-white and more likely to be widowed than the non-violent sample. Occupationally, there seemed to be little difference between the two groups. The female homicide group tended to be older, non-white and have more intermediate education than the male homicide group. With regard to occupation and marital status, there was little difference between the male and female homicide groups.

Operational Definitions of the Two Major Independent Variables

In order to measure unreciprocity and loss, it is necessary to examine role behavior. Five major roles were selected for analysis in operationalizing the concepts of unreciprocity and loss. These roles are common to the majority of the population in general; they are the childhood, educational, occupational, mate and parental roles. Direct or objective measures of unreciprocity were developed. The number of direct measures, specific indicators of each independent variable, were summed and a score from 0-5 recorded. The number of items measuring unreciprocity and loss varied from role to role; the predetermined scoring system served to distinguish the absence of the variable, scored 0, from the presence of the variable in a high degree, scored 5, for each role, indices were designed to ascertain the individual's score on the continuum measuring the independent variable.

The researcher read each of the case histories for individuals in the homicide and non-violent samples. The test instrument listed the predetermined operational definitions, and degrees of role unreciprocity and loss were recorded as scores. The measures of role unreciprocity were recorded. A segment of these measures dealt with unreciprocity experienced in interpersonal relationships; while another segment dealt with unreciprocity as experienced through structural blockage to role performance.

Operational Definitions

Child: Unreciprocity

(A) Evidence of child abuse or neglect; family investigated for child abuse or neglect

(B) Threats of violence

(C) Excessive physical punishment

(D) Abandonment or threats of abandonment

(E) Threats or attempts of suicide by parents or siblings

(F) Excessive psychological punishment, i.e., isolation for extended duration

(G) Child in foster homes (one point for each foster home)

(H) Child in institution (one point for each institution)

(I) Evidence of rejection by one or both parents, siblings, or peers

(J) Alcoholic or drug addicted parents or guardians (one point for each)

(K) Isolation from children of similar age

(L) Presence of birth defects

(M) Serious illness or injury

(N) Changes in residence (one point for each after the first)

(O) Multiple marriages by mother or father (one point for each marriage after the first)

(P) Stigma of some kind (i.e., labeled negatively for what another member of the family did, illegitimacy)

(Q) Arrest record of parents (both parents arrested one or more times)

(R) Both parents absent from home often

Scoring: One point for each of the above up to a maximum of five

Child: Loss of "Significant Other" (before age 16)

5 - Death of both parents, death of both major socializing agents if parents absent, institutionalized loss of parents

4 - Death of one parent

3 - Loss of parents through divorce or separation

2 - Death of close sibling

1 - Death of close relative or friend

0 - No significant loss

Student: Unreciprocity

(A) Grades repeated (one point for each grade)

(B) Fighting in school (two or more fights per year)

(C) Difficulty in school (D average or below)

(D) One or more threats of expulsion from school (one point each)

(E) Poor health which interferes with school role (absent over forty-one days per year for physical or mental illness)

(F) Addiction to drugs or alcohol

(G) Primary language not English

(H) Began school at age later than most children (age seven and up)

(I) Child forced to leave school to support family

(J) Evidence of rejection by other students or teachers

(K) School too far to attend regularly

Scoring: One point for each of the above up to a maximum of five

Student: Loss of Education

5 - Fourth grade or before terminated education

4 - Eigth grade or before terminated education

3 - One or two years of high school terminated education

2 - Three or four years of high school terminated education

1 - High school graduate, then termination of education

0 - None of the above losses

Occupational: Unreciprocity

(A) Chronic unemployment (unable to keep a job)

(B) Unable to find a job (unemployed more than three months)

(C) Unable to advance on a job

(D) Many fights or arguments with co-workers or employer

(E) Threat of loss of job or status

(F) Unable to seek a desired job because of responsibilities at home

(G) Poor education (eight grades or less)

(H) Poor health (loss of one or more months of work due to poor physical or mental health; one point for each month)

(I) Incarceration or hospitalization

(J) Advancing age (over 65)

(K) Alcoholism or drug addiction

(L) Mate chronically ill and cannot care for himself or herself

Scoring: One point for each up to a maximum of five

Occupational: Loss

5 - Permanent loss of job(s)

4 - Downward mobility (go from higher to lower status)

3 - Laid off from job for extended period (more than two months in one year)

2 - Retirement

1 - Loss of job role due to family responsibilities

0 - None of the above losses

Mate: Unreciprocity

(A) More than once a week fights and arguments with mate

(B) Chronic physical or mental illness of mate

(C) Six months or more of separations, or many separations

(D) Mate unfaithful

(E) Mate had periods of depression or alcoholism which lasted two months or more

(F) Mate repeatedly threatens or attempts suicide

(G) Mate repeatedly threatens divorce or separation

(H) Rejection by mate (pre-incarceration)

(I) Sexual incompatibility

(J) Absence of mate from the home for more than four weeks out of a year

(K) Alcoholism or drug addiction by either incarcerate or mate

(L) Homosexuality of mate if the couple is heterosexual; heterosexuality of mate if the couple is homosexual

(M) Incarceration or hospitalization for more than three months

Scoring: One point for each up to a maximum of five

Mate: Loss

5 - Death of two or more mates

4 - Death of one mate

3 - Divorce, legal separation, dissertion of two or more spouses

2 - Divorce, legal separation, dissertion of one spouse

1 - Informal separation from one spouse

0 - No loss

Parental: Unreciprocity

(A) Parent rejected by child or children

(B) Illegitimate children

(C) Delinquent child

(D) Child addicted to drugs or alcohol

(E) Mate undermines authority and esteem in eyes of the child

(F) Child attempts or threatens suicide

(G) Child attempts or threatens to run away from home

(H) Poor health as a parent

(I) Incarceration or hospitalization of parent or child

(J) Serious accident or injury of parent or child

(K) Absence of parent in the home a lot due to business traveling, military, etc.

Parental: Loss

5 - Death of child

4 - Child institutionalized for long periods of time or often

3 - Child taken from the family, eg. the state

2 - Child reared by other parent, or relative, without visiting privileges

1 - Child reared by other parent, or relative, with visiting privileges

0 - None of the above losses

High unreciprocity - scores of 3.5 to 5.0

Moderate unreciprocity - scores of 1.5 to 3.0

Low unreciprocity - scores of 0.0 to 1.0

High loss - scores of 4.0 to 5.0

Moderate loss - scores of 2.0 to 3.0

Low loss - scores of 0.0 to 1.0

Mode of Analysis

The data for this study was analyzed in the following manner. The scores of each variable were trichotomized, high, moderate and low. The Chi-Square test was used to determine whether or not the differences in the distribution of the scores for the samples were statistically significant. The Chi-Square level of significance was set at .05 or below. The Cramers V, a measure of correlation based on Chi-Square, was used as a measure of the strength of the association between variables.

The control variables of age, education, occupation, and race were dichotomized in the following way:

Low Age - 16-27
High Age - 28-51 plus
Low Education - no education to completion of the eleventh grade
High Education - twelth grade completed, high school diploma, technical school, college, graduate school
Low Occupation - none, unskilled, farm laborers, domestic workers, illegal occupations

High Occupation - professional, technical, managerial, administrative, clerical, sales, skilled craftsmen, foremen, enlisted/service
White - Caucasian
Non-White - Afro American, American Indian

Marital status was trichotomized into the following groups: married, single, and widowed, divorced or separated.

# CHAPTER V

## UNRECIPROCITY

This chapter presents the relationship between unreciprocity and the homicide and non-violent samples. It also illustrates the relationship of degrees of unreciprocity and sex of the homicide offender. The degree of unreciprocity was considered for five major roles, common to the majority of our society: child, student, occupation, and mate and parent.

The format for this chapter will be: first, presentation of the hypothesis for the role under analysis; second, presentation of the data table; third, a discussion of the data; last, a discussion of controls on the original associations.

Due to the large number of tables produced by the control variables, only the findings are discussed. The tables may be found in Appendix A.

The major hypotheses for this chapter are:

(1) As individuals' lives tend to be characterized by situations of high unreciprocity in role relationships, the likelihood of outwardly directed aggression, homicide, increases.

(2) Both male and female homicide offenders tend to experience in their lifetime similar degrees of unreciprocity.

From these general hypotheses, the following specific hypotheses and corollaries are drawn:

Hypothesis I : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high childhood unreciprocity than will the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis II: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high childhood unreciprocity.

The data in Table 9 supported Hypothesis I, that homicide offenders will have a significantly higher incidence of high level childhood unreciprocity than will the non-violent sample. Sixty-five and one-tenth percent of those experiencing high degrees of childhood unreciprocity were homicide offenders, while 34.9 percent were non-violent incarcerates. There is, then, a statistically significant positive relationship between unreciprocity in the childhood role and murderous behavior.

Support for Hypothesis II can be seen in Table 10. Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples had a singificantly higher incidence of childhood unreciprocity. Fifty-nine and three-tenths percent of those experiencing higher incidence of childhood unreciprocity were female homicide offenders, while 40.7 percent were male homicide offenders.

Hypothesis III: The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high student unreciprocity than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis IV : Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high student unreciprocity.

Data in Table 11 show that homicide offenders experienced greater unreciprocity in their student role than did the non-violent sample. Eighty-

TABLE 9

THE DEGREE OF CHILDHOOD UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 39.4 | 47.2 | 65.1 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 60.6 | 52.8 | 34.9 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 104 | 53 | 83 | 240 |

$V = .2269$

$X^2 = 12.354$

$P < .002$

TABLE 10

THE DEGREE OF CHILDHOOD UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 61.0 | 56.0 | 40.7 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 39.0 | 44.0 | 59.3 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 41 | 25 | 54 | 120 |

$V = .1861$

$X^2 = 4.155$

$P \angle$ N. S.

five and one-tenths percent of those characterized by high student unreciprocity were homicide offenders, compared to 14.9 percent who were non-violent incarcerates. Support was given to the hypothesis that homicide offenders tend to experience higher levels of unreciprocity in the student role.

Contrary to the relationship stated in Hypothesis IV, Table 12 shows a significant difference between male and female homicide offenders with regard to incidence of high student unreciprocity. Seventy-two and five-tenths of those with high level unreciprocity were male homicide offenders, while 27.5 percent were female homicide offenders. In summary, within the homicide sample, high student unreciprocity was positively associated with male homicide.

Hypothesis V : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high occupational unreciprocity than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis VI: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high occupational unreciprocity.

Table 13 shows a significant positive relationship between high occupational unreciprocity and homicide. Of those characterized by high levels of occupational unreciprocity, 77.3 percent were homicide offenders compared to 26.7 percent who were non-violent incarcerates. In accordance with Hypothesis V, the data show that homicide offenders tended to experience higher degrees of unreciprocity in the occupational role than did non-violent incarcerates.

The data on male and female homicide offenders did not support Hypothesis VI. Presentation of the findings can be seen in Table 14. Again,

TABLE 11

THE DEGREE OF STUDENT UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 35.3 | 57.4 | 85.1 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 64.7 | 42.6 | 14.9 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 139 | 54 | 47 | 240 |

$V = .3897$

$X^2 = 36.4489$

$P < .0000$

TABLE 12

THE DEGREE OF STUDENT UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 40.8 | 38.7 | 72.5 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 59.2 | 61.3 | 27.5 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 49 | 31 | 40 | 120 |

$V = .3069$

$X^2 = 11.3035$

$P < .003$

there was a significant difference between male and female homicide offenders with males comprising a higher proportion of those with high level occupational unreciprocity. Sixty-three and six-tenths of those with high levels of occupational unreciprocity were homicide offenders, while 36.4 percent were female homicide offenders. Within the homicide sample, high occupational unreciprocity was positively associated with male homicide.

Hypothesis VII : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of mate unreciprocity than will the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis VIII: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high mate role unreciprocity.

The data in Table 15 support hypothesis VII; homicide offenders had significantly higher levels of high mate role unreciprocity than the non-violent sample. Eighty-six and six-tenths percent of those experiencing high degrees of mate unreciprocity were homicide offenders, while 13.4 percent were non-violent incarcerates. There was then, a statistically significant positive relationship between unreciprocity in the mate role and murderous behavior.

Contrary to Hypothesis VII, Table 16 shows a significant difference between male and female homicide offenders with regard to incidence of high mate role unreciprocity. Sixty-five and five-tenths percent of those with high level unreciprocity were female homicide offenders, while 34.5 percent were male homicide offenders. In summary, within the homicide sample, mate role unreciprocity was positively associated with female homicide.

TABLE 13

THE DEGREE OF OCCUPATIONAL UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 40.5 | 61.3 | 73.3 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 59.5 | 38.7 | 26.7 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 148 | 62 | 30 | 240 |

$V = .2499$

$X^2 = 14.992$

$P < .0006$

TABLE 14

THE DEGREE OF OCCUPATIONAL UNRECIPROCITY

FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE

SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 36.7 | 65.8 | 63.6 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 63.3 | 34.2 | 36.4 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 60 | 38 | 22 | 120 |

$V = .2838$

$X^2 = 9.662$

$P < .008$

TABLE 15

THE DEGREE OF MATE ROLE UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 28.5 | 58.1 | 86.6 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 71.5 | 41.9 | 13.4 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 130 | 43 | 67 | 240 |

$V = .5046$

$X^2 = 61.098$

$P < .0000$

TABLE 16

THE DEGREE OF MATE ROLE UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 67.6 | 64.0 | 34.5 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 32.4 | 36.0 | 65.5 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 37 | 25 | 58 | 120 |

$V = .3173$

$X^2 = 12.084$

$P < .002$

Hypothesis IX: The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high parental unreciprocity than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis X : Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high parental unreciprocity.

Table 17 shows that homicide offenders experienced greater amounts of high level unreciprocity in the parental role than did the non-violent sample. Homicide offenders experienced 78.8 percent of the high level parental unreciprocity compared to 21.2 percent experienced by the non-violent individuals. In brief, the homicide offenders were characterized by higher parental unreciprocity than the non-violent sample.

In examining Table 18, the data show that, contrary to the stated hypothesis, male and female homicide offenders did differ significantly in degree of parental unreciprocity. While 76.9 percent of all high level parental unreciprocity was experienced by females, only 23.1 percent of the total was experienced by males. In conclusion, within the homicide sample, females tended to experience more parental unreciprocity than did males.

Interim Conclusions

In summary, the findings on unreciprocity in role relationships and type of behavior (homicidal or non-violent) supported the hypothesis that high degrees of unreciprocity were positively associated with homicidal behavior.

TABLE 17

THE DEGREE OF PARENTAL UNRECIPROCITY

FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT

SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 44.1 | 53.6 | 78.8 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 55.9 | 46.4 | 21.2 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 179 | 28 | 33 | 240 |

$V = .2376$

$X^2 = 13.546$

$P < .001$

TABLE 18

THE DEGREE OF PARENTAL UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 64.6 | 26.7 | 23.1 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 35.4 | 73.3 | 76.9 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 79 | 15 | 26 | 120 |

$V = .3816$

$X^2 = 17.473$

$P < .0002$

Within the homicide sample, the findings were contrary to the hypothesis. The contention that there would be no significant differences between sex groups with regard to high levels of unreciprocity was supported in only one role, that of child. In the mate and parental roles, there was a significant positive association between high levels of unreciprocity and the female homicide offenders. In the student and occupational roles, there was a significant positive association between high levels of unreciprocity and the male homicide offenders.

Associations between unreciprocity and type of violence, or non-violence, for five roles when controlled for age, education, occupation, marital status, and race are shown in Tables 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27. Associations between unreciprocity and sex of the homicide offender for five roles when controlled for age, education, occupation, marital status and race are shown in Tables 20, 22, 24, 26, and 28.

Age: When controlling for age, the original association between unreciprocity and type of behavior (murderous or non-violent) was maintained in the childhood, student and occupational roles. Only in the parental role did age seem to make a difference. Young homicidal and non-violent parents experienced similar degrees of unreciprocity in this role. The original correlation between high unreciprocity and homicide offenders was strengthened for the older homicidal parents.

Although the original relationship between sex of the offender and childhood unreciprocity was not significant, it was found that when controlling for age, among older murderers, women experienced 72 percent of the total high levels of unreciprocity. As was found in the original

TABLE 19

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE

| | Original Associations | | Low Age | | High Age | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .2269 | (∠.002 ) | .2339 | (∠.02 ) | .2333 | (∠.05 ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .2897 | (∠.0000) | .4585 | (∠.0000) | .4124 | (∠.0001) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2499 | (∠.0006) | .2373 | (∠.02 ) | .1415 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .5046 | (∠.0000) | .4505 | (∠.0000) | .4637 | (∠.0000) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .2376 | (∠.001 ) | .0853 | ( N.S. ) | .3373 | (∠.002 ) |

TABLE 20

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND AGE

| | Original Associations | | Low Age | | High Age | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .1860 | ( N.S. ) | .1096 | ( N.S. ) | .2594 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3069 | (<.003 ) | .2122 | ( N.S. ) | .3949 | (<.003 ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2838 | (<.008 ) | .3615 | (<.04 ) | .3123 | (<.02 ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .3173 | (<.002 ) | .3095 | ( N.S. ) | .3195 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .3816 | (<.0002) | .5416 | (<.001 ) | .2685 | ( N.S. ) |

relationship, whether young or old, men experienced greater amounts of unreciprocity in the student and occupational roles. The relationship between female homicide and higher levels of unreciprocity in the parental role was strengthened by the young female homicide offenders who experienced 80 percent of the total high levels of unreciprocity in that age grouping.

Education: When controlling for education, the original relationships between unreciprocity and type of violent behavior remained stable. A positive relationship appeared to exist between educational unreciprocity and homicidal behavior, whether one is highly educated or less educated.

With regard to sex of the homicide offender, controlling for education had little affect on the original relationships. Women experienced higher levels of unreciprocity in the parental and mate roles regardless of educational status. Men experienced higher levels of unreciprocity in the student and occupational roles regardless of education.

Among those with lower occupational status, the association between unreciprocity and violence was consistently maintained. However, among those high status individuals, it was found that murderous and non-violent parents experienced similar degrees of unreciprocity. In all other roles, murderers, of either high or low status, experienced more unreciprocity than non-murderers.

When controlling for occupation within the homicide sample, it was found that in the childhood role, the difference between male and female homicide offenders was not significant. Note, however, that women

TABLE 21

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Education | | High Education | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .2269 | (∠.002 ) | .2444 | (∠.006 ) | .1659 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3897 | (∠.0000) | .4046 | (∠.0000) | .2789 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2499 | (∠.0006) | .3095 | (∠.0003) | .1441 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .5096 | (∠.0000) | .4661 | (∠.0000) | .5952 | (∠.0000) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .2376 | (∠.001 ) | .2536 | (∠.004 ) | .1293 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 22

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND EDUCATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Education | | High Education | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .1860 | ( N.S. ) | .2071 | ( N.S. ) | .0976 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3069 | (<.003 ) | .3657 | (<.001 ) | .2156 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2838 | (<.008 ) | .3258 | (<.006 ) | .3563 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .3173 | (<.002 ) | .3303 | (<.005 ) | .3190 | ( N.S. ) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .3816 | (<.0002) | .3702 | (<.001 ) | .3690 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 23

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Occupation | | High Occupation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .2269 | (<.002 ) | .2727 | ( N.S. ) | .2122 | (<.01 ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3897 | (<.0000) | .2450 | ( N.S. ) | .4392 | (<.0000) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2499 | (<.0006) | .1847 | ( N.S. ) | .3163 | (<.0000) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .5046 | (<.0000) | .6043 | (<.0000) | .4941 | (<.0000) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .2376 | (<.001 ) | .0597 | ( N.S. ) | .3042 | (<.0003) |

TABLE 24

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND OCCUPATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Occupation | | High Occupation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .1860 | ( N.S. ) | .3981 | ( N.S. ) | .1899 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3069 | (<.003 ) | .0183 | ( N.S. ) | .4193 | (<.0004) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2838 | (<.008 ) | .1674 | ( N.S. ) | .3532 | (<.004 ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .3173 | (<.002 ) | .4743 | (<.03 ) | .2956 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .38.6 | (<.0002) | .4242 | ( N.S. ) | .3644 | (<.002 ) |

in categories of low occupation experienced 62 percent of that category's total high level unreciprocity. Both men and women in low occupational categories experienced similar degrees of unreciprocity in their occupational role.

Marital Status: When controlling for marital status, the correlation between unreciprocity and violence doubled in the student and occupational roles for unmarried people. However, there was little difference between the homicide and non-violent groups for widowed, separated and divorced people in the occupational role. With this exception, in all three marital categories a positive relationship was maintained between role unreciprocity and murderous behavior.

Within the homicide sample, widowed, divorced and separated women experienced greater amounts of high level unreciprocity in the childhood role, 69 percent of the total for this category. While married and single men experienced greater amounts of high unreciprocity in the student role, divorced, widowed or separated men and women experienced similar amounts of student unreciprocity. As in the original relationship, men experienced more unreciprocity in the occupational role regardless of marital status; more specifically, single men experienced greater unreciprocity in this role. Regardless of marital status, women tended to have higher levels of unreciprocity in the mate and parental roles; married women in the mate role and single women in the parental role experienced higher levels of unreciprocity than the overall sample. Widowed, divorced and separated men and women tended to experience similar degrees of unreciprocity in the mate and parental roles.

TABLE 25

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS

| | Original Associations | | Married | | Single | | Separated, Divorced, Widowed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .2269 | (<.002 ) | .2613 | ( N.S. ) | .2677 | ( N.S. ) | .2457 | (<.05 ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3897 | (<.0000) | .3764 | (<.01 ) | .6263 | (<.0000) | .3093 | (<.009 ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2499 | (<.0006) | .2081 | ( N.S. ) | .5048 | (<.0001) | .0863 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .5046 | (<.0000) | .5457 | (<.0001) | .3978 | (<.002 ) | .4549 | (<.0000) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .2376 | (<.001 ) | .2568 | ( N.S. ) | .1364 | ( N.S. ) | .3232 | (<.006 ) |

TABLE 26

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

| | Original Associations | | Married | | Single | | Separated, Divorced, Widowed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .1860 | ( N.S. ) | .1214 | ( N.S. ) | .4616 | ( N.S. ) | .2782 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3069 | (<.003 ) | .3349 | ( N.S. ) | .5944 | (<.01 ) | .1912 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2838 | (<.008 ) | .2316 | ( N.S. ) | .4886 | (<.05 ) | .3410 | (<.03 ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .3173 | (<.002 ) | .6756 | (<.0003) | .3558 | ( N.S. ) | .1520 | ( N.S. ) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .3816 | (<.0002) | .4229 | (<.04 ) | .7035 | (<.002 ) | .2088 | ( N.S. ) |

Race: Race seemed to have little effect on the original associations between unreciprocity and type of violent behavior. Whether white, or non-white, a positive relationship between unreciprocity and violence maintained.

Similarly, race had little effect on the original associations between sex of the homicide offender and levels of unreciprocity in role relationships. All associations were maintained when controlling for race with the exception of the occupational role where non-white women and non-white men experienced similar degrees of unreciprocity. Unreciprocity in the childhood role when controlling for race reached its first significant level in the case of non-white females who experienced more unreciprocity in this role than non-white males.

Summary

In summary, lives of homicide offenders appeared to be characterized by higher levels of unreciprocity than those of non-violent incarcerates. However, this relationship did not hold for young people in the parental role, high status people in the parental role, and divorced, separated or widowed people in the occupational role.

More specifically for the homicidal sample, it can be said that women typically experienced more unreciprocity in the roles of mate, parent, and, under certain conditions, child. Men, in general, experienced more unreciprocity in the roles of student and employee. This relationship did not hold, however, for low status men and women who experienced similar degrees of student and mate unreciprocity. Finally, the original association between homicide and levels of occupational unreciprocity did not hold for non-white males and non-white females who experienced similar degrees of unreciprocity.

TABLE 27

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE

| | Original Associations | | White | | Non-White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .2269 | (<.002 ) | .1871 | ( N.S. ) | .2487 | (<.01 ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3897 | (<.0000) | .3982 | (<.0002) | .3697 | (<.0001) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2499 | (<.0006) | .3094 | (<.005 ) | .2149 | (<.04 ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .5046 | (<.0000) | .4487 | (<.0000) | .5877 | (<.0000) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .2376 | (<.001 ) | .2325 | (<.05 ) | .2370 | (<.02 ) |

TABLE 28

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND RACE

| | Original Associations | | White | | Non-White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Childhood Unreciprocity | .1860 | ( N.S. ) | .1870 | ( N.S. ) | .3089 | (<.02 ) |
| Student Unreciprocity | .3069 | (<.003 ) | .4533 | (<.009 ) | .2390 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupational Unreciprocity | .2838 | (<.008 ) | .4042 | (<.02 ) | .1942 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Unreciprocity | .3173 | (<.002 ) | .3545 | (<.05 ) | .3204 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Unreciprocity | .3816 | (<.0002) | .3812 | (<.03 ) | .3707 | (<.005 ) |

# CHAPTER VI

## LOSS

The organization of this chapter will follow the format employed in the chapter on unreciprocity: presentation of the hypotheses for the role under analysis, data table, discussion of the data, discussion of the controls on the original associations.

This chapter presents the relationship between role loss, the homicide and non-violent samples; as well as presenting the relationship between role loss, the male homicide sample and the female homicide sample. The degree of role loss is considered for the roles of child, student, occupation, mate and parent.

Hypothesis XI : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of childhood loss than will the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis XII: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high childhood loss.

Table 29 supports Hypothesis XI, homicide offenders had a significantly higher incidence of childhood loss than did non-violent incarcerates. Of those experiencing higher levels of childhood loss, 65.6 percent were homicide offenders compared to 34.4 percent non-violent individuals. There appeared to be a positive association between childhood loss and homicide.

Hypothesis XII was supported, as can be seen in Table 30. There was no significant difference between male and female homicide offenders with regard to loss experienced in the childhood role. Of the high

TABLE 29

THE DEGREE OF CHILDHOOD LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 39.8 | 56.2 | 65.6 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 60.2 | 43.8 | 34.4 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 128 | 48 | 64 | 240 |

$V = .2262$

$X^2 = 12.281$

$P < .002$

TABLE 30

THE DEGREE OF CHILDHOOD LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLE IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 60.8 | 37.0 | 47.6 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 39.2 | 63.0 | 52.4 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 51 | 27 | 42 | 120 |

$V = .1882$

$X^2 = 4.250$

$P < N.S.$

level loss experienced, males experienced 47.6 percent, while females experienced 52.4 percent.

Hypothesis XIII: The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high student loss than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis XIV : Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high student loss.

Strong support for Hypothesis XIII is shown in Table 31. Of total high level loss experienced in the student role, homicide offenders experienced 78.8 percent compared to 21.2 for the non-violent sample. Loss in the student role than was positively associated with murderous behavior.

Within the homicide sample, Table 32 shows that student role loss was not significantly associated with sex of the homicide offender.

Hypothesis XV : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high occupational loss than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis XVI: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high occupational loss.

Table 33 indicates no support for the hypothesis that homicide offenders have significantly higher incidence of high occupational loss. Of the total high level occupational loss, homicide offenders experienced 54.3 percent, while non-violent incarcerates experienced 45.7 percent.

TABLE 31

THE DEGREE OF STUDENT LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENT

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 34.7 | 36.4 | 78.8 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 65.3 | 63.6 | 21.2 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 72 | 88 | 80 | 240 |

$V = .4068$

$X^2 = 39.718$

$P < .0000$

TABLE 32

THE DEGREE OF STUDENT LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 68.0 | 40.6 | 49.2 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 32.0 | 59.4 | 50.8 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 25 | 32 | 63 | 120 |

V = .1904

$X^2$ = 4.349

P N. S.

Support was given for the hypothesis that there is no significant association between high loss in the occupational role and sex of the offender. Of the total high level loss experienced, males accounted for 47.4 percent, females 52.6 percent, a difference of only 5.2 percent.

Hypothesis XVII : The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high mate role loss than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis XVIII: Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high mate role loss.

Support for Hypothesis XVII was given as can be seen in Table 35. The homicide offenders had significantly higher incidence of high mate role loss. Of the total high level loss experienced in the mate role, homicide offenders accounted for 76.2 percent compared to the non-violent offenders 23.8 percent. High mate role loss was then positively associated with murderous behavior.

Contrary to the hypothesized relationship, female homicide offenders experienced more of the high level mate role loss than their male counterparts. Eighty-seven and five-tenths percent of the total high loss was accounted for by the female homicide offenders; while male homicide offenders experienced only 12.5 percent of the total.

Hypothesis XIX: The homicide sample will have a significantly higher incidence of high parental loss than the non-violent sample.

Hypothesis XX : Neither the female, nor male, homicide samples will have a significantly higher incidence of high parental loss.

TABLE 33

THE DEGREE OF OCCUPATIONAL LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 48.2 | 64.3 | 54.3 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 51.8 | 35.7 | 45.7 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 191 | 14 | 35 | 240 |

V = .0831

$X^2$ = 1.657

P N. S.

TABLE 34

THE DEGREE OF OCCUPATIONAL LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 50.0 | 66.7 | 47.4 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 50.0 | 33.3 | 52.6 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 92 | 9 | 19 | 120 |

V = .0922

$X^2$ = 1.020

P N. S.

TABLE 35

THE DEGREE OF MATE LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percents) | Moderate (Percents) | High (Percents) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 42.3 | 68.2 | 76.2 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 57.7 | 31.8 | 23.8 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 175 | 44 | 21 | 240 |

$V = .2561$

$X^2 = 15.746$

$P < .0004$

TABLE 36

THE DEGREE OF MATE LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 66.2 | 33.3 | 12.5 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 33.8 | 66.7 | 87.5 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 74 | 30 | 16 | 120 |

$V = .4092$

$X^2 = 20.089$

$P < .0000$

No support for Hypothesis XIX was given by the data, as can be seen in Table 37. A closer examination of the table will show that the low and moderate categories seemed to be responsible for the non-significance of the findings. In looking only at the high level parental loss, it was found that 70 percent of the total was constituted by the homicide offenders compared to the 30 percent of the non-violent sample.

Support for Hypothesis XX was given by the data. As Table 38 indicates, there was not a significantly higher incidence of high parental loss noted in either sex group.

Interim Conclusions

High degrees of role loss tended to be associated with homicide in the child, student, mate and parental roles. Within the homicide sample, there was no significant differences between males and females with regard to high levels of loss in the child, student, occupational or parental roles. However, in the role of mate, women experienced significantly greater amounts of high loss than their male counterparts. With the exception of this role, no significant relationship between role loss and sex of the offender appeared to exist.

Associations between loss and type of behavior (violent or non-violent) for five roles when controlled for age, education, occupation, marital status, and race are shown in Tables 29, 31, 33, 35 and 37. Associations between loss and type of violence, or non-violence, for five roles when controlled for age, education, occupation, marital status and race are shown in Tables 30, 32, 34, 36 and 38.

TABLE 37

THE DEGREE OF PARENTAL LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 48.2 | 66.7 | 70.0 | 120 |
| Non-Violent | 51.8 | 33.3 | 30.0 | 120 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 218 | 12 | 10 | 240 |

V = .1160

$X^2$ = 3.227

P N. S.

TABLE 38

THE DEGREE OF PARENTAL LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES IN PERCENTS

| | Low (Percent) | Moderate (Percent) | High (Percent) | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 54.3 | 25.0 | 28.6 | 61 |
| Female Homicide | 45.7 | 75.0 | 71.4 | 59 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 105 | 8 | 7 | 120 |

V = .1831

$X^2$ = 4.025

P N. S.

Age: When controlling for age, the original associations between loss and type of violent, or non-violent, behavior remained stable in the occupational and parental roles. Older homicide offenders accounted for 82 percent of the total high level loss in the childhood role, as well as experiencing more of the high level loss in the student role. The data showed little difference between type of violent behavior within the younger category and level of mate role loss.

Original associations between loss and sex of the homicide offender were maintained in the childhood and student roles when controlled for age. Young males experienced 60 percent more of the total high levels of loss in the occupational role, while young females accounted for the total amount of high level mate and parental loss.

Education: When education was controlled, the original associations between loss and type of violent, or non-violent, behavior were maintained in all roles except that of the child. Among highly educated individuals, whether homicidal or non-violent, there was little difference in childhood loss. Where Table 41 shows differences in correlations, the direction of the original association was maintained for high levels of role loss between the homicide and non-violent samples, as well as between male and female homicide offenders.

Occupation: The original associations between role loss and type of violent behavior were maintained for the high levels of loss in the childhood, occupational, mate and parental roles. Within the high status category, it was found that there was little difference between homicidal and non-violent offenders with regard to student role loss. Of all high student role loss experienced by members of low occupational

TABLE 39

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE

| | Original Associations | | Low Age | | High Age | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .2262 | (<.002 ) | .1504 | ( N.S. ) | .3824 | (<.0005) |
| Student Loss | .4068 | (<.0000) | .3773 | (<.0001) | .3088 | (<.007 ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0831 | ( N.S. ) | .1527 | ( N.S. ) | .1177 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .2561 | (<.0004) | .1187 | ( N.S. ) | .2669 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1160 | ( N.S. ) | .1045 | ( N.S. ) | .0922 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 40

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND AGE

| | Original Associations | | Low Age | | High Age | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .1882 | ( N.S. ) | .2377 | ( N.S. ) | .1748 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .0922 | ( N.S. ) | .2990 | ( N.S. ) | .1148 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .4092 | (<.0000) | .5082 | (<.02 ) | .3165 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1831 | ( N.S. ) | .4052 | (<.02 ) | .0582 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 41

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Education | | High Education | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .2262 | (<.002 ) | .2626 | (<.002 ) | .0546 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .4068 | (<.0000) | .4391 | (<.0000) | .2274 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0831 | ( N.S. ) | .1457 | ( N.S. ) | .0676 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .2561 | (<.0004) | .2467 | (<.005 ) | .2873 | (<.05 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1160 | ( N.S. ) | .0729 | ( N.S. ) | .2356 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 42

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND EDUCATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Education | | High Education | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .1882 | ( N.S. ) | .1473 | ( N.S. ) | .2457 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .1904 | ( N.S. ) | .0893 | ( N.S. ) | .2443 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0922 | ( N.S. ) | .1069 | ( N.S. ) | .1760 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .4092 | (<.0000) | .3962 | (<.0006) | .5230 | (<.02 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1831 | ( N.S. ) | .2600 | (<.04 ) | .0934 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 43

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Occupation | | High Occupation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .2262 | (<.002 ) | .2825 | ( N.S. ) | .2595 | (<.002 ) |
| Student Loss | .4068 | (<.0000) | .1238 | ( N.S. ) | .5075 | (<.0000) |
| Occupation Loss | .0831 | ( N.S. ) | .0298 | ( N.S. ) | .1054 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .2561 | (<.0004) | .2448 | ( N.S. ) | .2697 | (<.001 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1160 | ( N.S. ) | .2336 | ( N.S. ) | .1244 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 44

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND OCCUPATION

| | Original Associations | | Low Occupation | | High Occupation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .1882 | ( N.S. ) | .2007 | ( N.S. ) | .2512 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .1904 | ( N.S. ) | .1664 | ( N.S. ) | .2452 | ( N.S. ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0922 | ( N.S. ) | .2194 | ( N.S. ) | .0939 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .4092 | (<.0000) | .5352 | (<.01 ) | .3745 | (<.002 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1831 | ( N.S. ) | .1738 | ( N.S. ) | .2016 | ( N.S. ) |

categories, 82.4 percent was accounted for by the homicide sample.

Within the homicide sample, associations between loss and sex of the offender were maintained in the childhood, student, and parental roles. Of all homicide offenders with high occupational status and high levels of occupational loss, 66.7 percent were female. Eighty percent of all high status murderers with high levels of mate role loss were female.

Marital Status: In the occupational and mate roles, the original associations between loss and type of non-violent behavior remained stable. Within the childhood role, married murderers experienced 92.3 percent of the total high level loss for married offenders; while single offenders, whether murderous or non-violent, tended to experience similar degrees of childhood role loss. Ninety percent of all high level loss in the student role was experienced by married homicide offenders. In the parental role, all high level loss was experienced by the single non-violent offenders.

Within the homicide sample, the original associations were maintained in the occupational and parental roles. Single, female homicide offenders accounted for 70 percent of the high loss in the childhood role compared to 30 percent experienced by single males. Married male murderers accounted for 66.7 percent of high loss in the student role; while married females accounted for all high mate role loss. Widowed, divorced and separated women had 63.3 percent of the total high level loss in the student role, with there being little difference in single male and female homicide offenders' levels of student role loss.

TABLE 45

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS

| | Original Associations | | Married | | Single | | Separated, Divorced, Widowed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .2262 | (<.002 ) | .4099 | (<.004 ) | .1936 | ( N.S. ) | .2004 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .4068 | (<.0000) | .3268 | (<.03 ) | .7294 | (<.0000) | .2737 | (<.02 ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0831 | ( N.S. ) | .0812 | ( N.S. ) | .1992 | ( N.S. ) | .0403 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .2561 | (<.0004) | .2325 | ( N.S. ) | .2895 | (<.04 ) | .1506 | ( N.S. ) |
| Parental Loss | .1160 | ( N.S. ) | .1255 | ( N.S. ) | .0276 | ( N.S. ) | .1511 | ( N.S.) |

TABLE 46

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

| | Original Associations | | Married | | Single | | Separated, Divorced, Widowed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .1882 | ( N.S. ) | .1118 | ( N.S. ) | .6653 | (<.004 ) | .1830 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .1904 | ( N.S. ) | .3127 | ( N.S. ) | .0503 | ( N.S. ) | .3096 | (<.05 ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0922 | ( N.S. ) | .3007 | ( N.S. ) | .1689 | ( N.S. ) | .3287 | (<.04 ) |
| Mate Loss | .4092 | (<.0000) | .5064 | (<.01 ) | .4166 | ( N.S. ) | .3287 | (<.04 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1831 | ( N.S. ) | .1546 | ( N.S. ) | .0000 | ( N.S. ) | .2216 | ( N.S. ) |

Race: When race was controlled, it was found that the original associations between loss and type of violent behavior maintained in the childhood, occupational, mate and parental roles. In the student role, whether homicide or non-violent, there was little difference among white offenders. Among non-white offenders, 93.9 percent of all high level student loss was experienced by homicide offenders.

With regard to male and female homicide offenders, the original associations remained stable in the roles of student and parent. Non-white females accounted for 61.3 percent of the total high level loss in the childhood role, and 75 percent of the total high level loss in the occupational role. White males experienced 85.7 percent of all high level loss in the occupational role, while white females experienced 66.7 percent of all high level loss in the mate role.

Summary

In summary, lives of homicide offenders appeared to be characterized by higher levels of role loss than the non-violent sample. This relationship did not hold, however, for young people in the mate role, highly educated people in the childhood role, members of high occupational categories in the student role, single offenders in the childhood role, and white offenders in the student role.

More specifically, the homicide sample showed little difference between males and females with regard to loss. These associations were, however, influenced and altered among young males in the occupational role, young females in the mate and parental role, women in the childhood role, married males in the student role, married females in the mate role,

TABLE 47

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE

| | Original Associations | | White | | Non-White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .2262 | (∠.002 ) | .2621 | (∠.02 ) | .1542 | ( N.S. ) |
| Student Loss | .4068 | (∠.0000) | .1736 | ( N.S. ) | .5730 | (∠.0000) |
| Occupation Loss | .0831 | ( N.S. ) | .1328 | ( N.S. ) | .0703 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .2561 | (∠.0004) | .2222 | ( N.S. ) | .3040 | (∠.002 ) |
| Parental Loss | .1160 | ( N.S. ) | .1953 | ( N.S. ) | .0696 | ( N.S. ) |

TABLE 48

ORIGINAL ASSOCIATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

WITH CONTROLS FOR SEX AND RACE

| | Original Associations | | White | | Non-White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V | P | V | P | V | P |
| Child Loss | .1882 | ( N.S. ) | .1667 | ( N.S. ) | .2813 | (<.05 ) |
| Student Loss | .1904 | ( N.S. ) | .0224 | ( N.S. ) | .3168 | (<.02 ) |
| Occupation Loss | .0922 | ( N.S. ) | .2586 | ( N.S. ) | .1876 | ( N.S. ) |
| Mate Loss | .4092 | (<.0000) | .2652 | ( N.S. ) | .4934 | (<.0001) |
| Parental Loss | .1831 | ( N.S. ) | .2773 | ( N.S. ) | .1474 | ( N.S. ) |

widowed, divorced and separated women in the student role, non-white females in the childhood roles and occupational role, white males in the occupational role and white females in the mate role.

# CHAPTER VII

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the limitations of the study, a review of the theoretical orientation in relation to the findings and suggestions for further research. Particular attention will be given to the anomolous findings within the sex group of the homicide offenders.

### Limitations of the Study

North Carolina Combined Records, the source of the data for this study, contains material not specifically designed for this study. As secondary data, the records were adequate, yet question could be raised with regard to the applicability of the source to this particular research. Furthermore, the format used by North Carolina Combined Records limited the operational definitions to data contained within the files.

Palmer's substantive definitions of the concepts, unreciprocity and loss, were first operationalized by Humphrey (1973). An appeal to "face validity" was made in determining what indicators were appropriate. The scope of the operational definitions was limited by the reliance on secondary data. Despite this restriction, the test instrument was able to discriminate between murderous and non-violent individuals in New Hampshire, on the basis of Humphrey's operational indicators of unreciprocity and loss.

A pilot study of North Carolina incarcerates was conducted by this researcher in April of 1973 to ascertain whether or not the test instrument successfully used in New Hampshire (Humphrey: 1973) was able

to discriminate between homicide and non-violent criminal offenders in North Carolina. The results of this test were affirmative; the test instrument employed did discriminate between violent and non-violent individuals regardless of regional background or incidence of non-violent criminal offense.

In an attempt to check for the reliability of the data in an inmate's file, if two sources of information were conflicting, the item was recorded as "missing information." In the case of the homicide offender, such checks were facilitated by the wealth of information recorded; such was not the case among non-violent incarcerates whose files were often sketchy. The North Carolina Department of Rehabilitation and Control does, however, employ only one format for recording data on inmates; therefore, though data on murderers was richer, specific item indexing was comparable in both the violent and non-violent samples.

Personal interviews with the inmates possibly could have provided beneficial supplementary material for this study. Permission to conduct interviews was denied, however, by prison officials.

Finally, this study was limited in its generalizability. The findings were restricted to North Carolina incarcerates serving sentences for first degree murder, first degree manslaughter, second degree murder, or non-violent property offenses. This restriction was particularly limiting with regard to the females in the sample. A sound and plausible case could be made that females incarcerated in this state do not typify the female homicidal population in North Carolina. Data conceivably could be produced to indicate that females are not actively prosecuted in this state. The cultural idea that women are to be protected may be operating

within the Court system. If such is the case, our convicted samples contain an example of women selected on some variable other than incidence of criminal offense. No attempt was made in this study to include either females or males outside the North Carolina penal system for comparison. Such an attempt would present numerous pragmatic difficulties in establishing which of the acquitted offenders were actually guilty. Nevertheless, within the present study, the findings between sex of the homicide offender, unreciprocity and loss may be influenced by the possible idiasyncratic character of the female population.

## A Review of the Theoretical Orientation in Relation to the Findings

This research considered effects of unreciprocity and loss on forms of violent or non-violent behavior. It was also concerned with any differences between the sexes in the homicide sample. Five roles, common to the majority of the American populace were considered: the roles of child, student, employee, mate and parent. Operational definitions for the two independent variables were made for each of these roles. Scores of unreciprocity and loss were recorded on a 0-5 continuum for each individual in each role. A comparison of scores was then made between non-violent, homicide and male homicide, female homicide samples with regard to the amount of experienced unreciprocity and loss. Finally, controls for age, education, occupation, marital status and race were instituted to observe their affects on the original associations.

Once again, the major hypotheses were:

(1) As individuals' lives tend to be characterized by situations of high unreciprocity in role relationships,

the likelihood of outwardly directed violence, homicide, increases.

(2) As individuals' lives tend to be characterized by severe role loss, the likelihood of outwardly directed violence, homicide, increases.

(3) Both male and female homicide offenders tend to experience in their lifetime similar degrees of unreciprocity.

(4) Both male and female homicide offenders tend to experience in their lifetime similar degrees of role loss.

The major findings of this study are:

(1) High levels of unreciprocity are positively associated with homicidal behavior.

(2) High levels of loss are positively associated with homicidal behavior.

(3) High levels of unreciprocity are positively associated with the sex of the homicide offender.

(4) Generally, there is no relationship between high levels of loss and sex of the offender.

High degrees of unreciprocity were positively associated with homicidal behavior for all five roles under analysis: the childhood, student, occupational, mate and parental. The relationship failed to be upheld in the case of young people in the parental role, high status individuals in the parental role, and divorced, separated, or widowed people in the occupational role.

The contention that there would be no significant difference between male and female homicide offenders with regard to high levels of unreciprocity

was not supported. In the mate and parental roles, women endured greater amounts of unreciprocity before directing their aggression homicidally. In the student and occupational roles, there was a significant positive association between high levels of unreciprocity and the male homicide offender. With regard to the childhood role, a trend of higher levels of unreciprocity being experienced by women maintained throughout, but was significant only in the case of non-white females.

High degrees of role loss were positively associated with murderous behavior in the child, student, mate and parental roles. Only in the occupational role did non-violent offenders experience similar degrees of role loss as murderers. When controls were instituted, it was found that the original relationship was not stable in the case of young people in the mate role, highly educated people in the childhood role, high status individuals in the student role, single offenders in the childhood role, and white offenders in the student role.

In general, male and female homicide offenders did not experience significantly different loss experiences. A significant difference was established, however, in the case of young males in the occupational role, young females in the mate and parental roles, high status women in the occupational and mate roles, single women in the childhood role, married males in the student roles, married females in the mate role, divorced, widowed or separated women in the student role, non-white females in the childhood and occupational roles, white males in the occupational role and white females in the mate role who experienced significantly higher degrees of role loss.

Role unreciprocity and loss were concepts used to explain murder in this study. Both unreciprocity and role loss were positively associated

with homicide. Homicide offenders typically had significantly more negative life experiences than the non-violent incarcerates. Previous research on unreciprocity and loss have compared homicide offenders and non-criminal, non-violent samples. This research attempted to illustrate that the difference between homicidal and non-violent individuals was a function of unreciprocity and loss, rather than being a difference between criminal and non-criminal offenders; thus, a criminal, non-violent comparison group was used.

Homicide offenders typically experienced unreciprocity in the childhood role in the form of being institutionalized because of negligent or abusive parents. Many murderers had alcoholic parents, or absent parents, who left child rearing up to relatives. Most role loss experienced by homicide offenders in their early lives was due to parental rejection or abandonment of the child, or was the result of divorce or separation by the parents.

Murderers typically had difficulty in school, both academic and social. Often, aggressive behavior was manifested in this early role. Fighting in school and expulsion from school were much more prevalent among homicide offenders. Homicide offenders tended to leave school earlier than the non-violent sample. Social, rather than academic, adjustments seemed to account for more of this phenomenon.

Occupationally the homicide offender tended to be a less reliable worker, more often unable to find or keep a job. Downward mobility tended to characterize the work histories of homicide offenders.

The mate role tended to be highly unreciprocating for homicide offenders. The murderers' mates were typically unfaithful, sexually

unfulfilling, often absent sparring partners. Very few of the homicide sample had successful, supportive relationships with their mates. Divorce, separation or dissertion was commonplace among the members of the homicide sample.

As parents, the homicide offenders tended to be negligent, as were their parents. Often, children of the homicidal individuals were living with relatives or in foster homes. Many of the children were taken from the parents by state agencies or concerned relatives.

The findings suggested that female homicide offenders experienced more unreciprocity in the mate and parental roles, while males endured greater unreciprocity in the student and occupational roles. Women murderers had higher incidences of unfaithful mates, more arguments with their mates, more alcoholic or addicted mates and a higher incidence of separation from their mates. In the parental role, many female homicide mothers were single with no mate to help in the child rearing process. Many women murderers had their children institutionalized (in orphanages, or foster homes), or relinquished their parental role to relatives. Since illegitimate children typically do not become the responsibility of their father, it is easy to understand why women have higher incidences of unreciprocity in this role. Even in the case of married parents, the burden of child rearing is usually carried by the woman.

Occupational and student role unreciprocity were positively associated with male homicide. The male murderers seemed to experience their most severe unreciprocity in secondary, rather than primary role relationships. Since men characteristically are responsible for the

financial support of their mates and/or families, that they should experience more blockage in these roles seemed likely.

Suggestions for Future Study

The theory of the relationship between unreciprocity, role loss and homicide has been proven valid across regional lines, but its applicability extends potentially cross-culturally and cross-temperally. International and historical research studies would add to the potential generalizability of the theory.

The findings of this study also have implications for change within the penal system. Reduction of unreciprocity within the prison system itslef may reduce the intra-prison aggressiveness, as well as diminish the recidivism rate among aggressive incarcerates.

School systems could be aware of potentially aggressive individuals and institute policy designed to reduce role blockage and loss. Social welfare agencies, probation officers, families and employers could also initiate preventive policies based on knowledge of the potentially aggressive personality.

More research is needed on the female criminal in general, and the female homicide offender in particular. Further study is needed to isolate factors which explain womens' higher levels of unreciprocity in the mate, parental, and under certain conditions, childhood roles.

It is interesting to note that women tended to experience higher levels of unreciprocity in role relationships which are more personal, i. e., the parent, mate and childhood roles. Men tended to experience high levels of unreciprocity in more formal role relationships, i. e., the student and occupational roles. If murder is indeed a crime of passion

which takes place among those most intimately involved, further examination may show the parental, mate and childhood roles to be most salient to the question of murder. Further study is needed before such assertions can be made; however, it may be that in the case of criminal homicide, structural blockage to role performance is less important than blockage to intimate relations. If this is the case, data on women may lead to a qualification of the frustration-aggression hypothesis.

Present empirical studies based on the frustration-aggression hypothesis have dealt only with men; women may have learned means of dealing with frustration at levels to which men react aggressively. Perhaps women internalize norms and accept authority more readily than men; and therefore, as a group exhibit higher degrees of social integration. This would certainly account for the traditionally lower numbers of women involved in aggressive crimes.

The difference in the socialization of males and females reflects itself in the subsequent differences in role behavior. Women, being socialized to a passive, submissive role are less likely to react homicidally to the problem of frustration. While aggressive behavior is sanctioned and encouraged for males, such behavior is disapproved for females. The affective and nurturtive orientation taught to women as proper gender role behavior does not lend itself to violent expression of frustration.

Currently there are two possibly interrelated social changes taking place with regard to women. First, women appear to be breaking away from traditionally defined passive female role behavior, the very role behavior which may be responsible for their relative lack of

participation in crime. That socialized passivity has kept females from being criminally active seems especially plausible with regard to the second social change, an increase in female crimes in general, and homicide in particular. The changing role of women in society may bring the number of women homicide offenders closer to that of males. Presently, women commit fewer murders than men, even though they tend to experience greater amounts of unreciprocity in three of five major life roles. If socialization toward passivity is responsible for this anomoly, and if sex role socialization continues to decline, we may expect more and more women involved in crime in general, and homicide in particular.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bernard, Jessie
1971 Women and the Public Interests. Chicago: Aldine.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin
1960 Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Cohen, Albert K.
1954 Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Dollard, J., et al.
1939 Frustration and Aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dorpat, Theodore L., Joan K. Jackson and Herbert S. Ripley
1965 "Broken Homes and Attempted and Completed Suicide." Archives of General Psychiatry, 22: 213-216.

Durkheim, Emile
1966 Suicide. trans. by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson, ed. by George Simpson, New York: The Free Press.

Elliott, Mable
1952 Crime in Modern Society. New York: Harper, 201-202.

Gillin, John L.
1946 The Wisconsin Prisoner. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gold, David
1958 "Suicide, Homicide and the Socialization of Aggression," American Journal of Sociology, 63: 651-661.

Henry, Andrew and James Short
1954 Suicide and Homicide. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Huber, Joan, ed.
1973 Changing Women in a Changing Society. Chicago: University Press.

Humphrey, John A.
1973 "Suicide, Homicide and Role Relationships in New Hampshire." Doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire.

Lalli, M. and S. H. Turner
1968 "Suicide and Homicide." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 59: 191-200.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Miller, Walter B.
1958 "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues, 14: 5-19.

Palmer, Stuart
1960 A Study of Murder. New York: Thomas Y. Crawell Co.

Palmer, Stuart
1965 "Murder and Suicide in 40 Non-Literate Societies." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.

Palmer, Stuart
1970 Deviance and Conformity. New Haven: College and University Press.

Palmer, Stuart
1972a The Violent Society. New Haven: College and University Press.

Palmer, Stuart
1972b "Suicide and Homicide: Toward an Integration of Theory." A paper presented at annual meeting of the American Association of Suicidology, Detroit, March 31, 1972.

Palmer, Stuart
1972c "High Social Integration as a Source of Deviance." British Journal of Sociology.

Porterfield, A. L. and R. H. Filbert
1948 Crime, Suicide, and Social Well-Being in Your State and City. Fort Worth, Texas: Leo Potisham Foundation.

Short, James F. and Fred L. Strodtbeck
1965 Group Process and Gang Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snyder, John H.
1974 North Carolina Elements of Criminal Offenses. North Carolina: W. L. Jones Publishing Co.

Statistical Abstracts
1970

Straus, Jacqueline and Murray A. Straus
1953 "Suicide, Homicide, and Social Structural Change in Ceylon." American Journal of Sociology, 58: 461-469.

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey
1960 Principles of Criminology. Chicago: Lippincott.

Sykes, G. and David Matza
1957 "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 22: 664-670.

Uniform Crime Reports
1972 Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

United States Census
1970 Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wise, Nancy B.
1967 "Juvenile Delinquency Among Middle Class Girls," Middle Class Juvenile Delinquency. ed. by Edmund W. Vez. New York: Harper and Row.

Wolfgang, Marvin E.
1958 Patterns in Criminal Homicide. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wolfgang, M. E., Arlene Kelly, Hans C. Bolde
1962 "Comparison of the Executed and Commuted Among Admissions to Death Row," ed. Norman Johnson et al. The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. New York: Wiley, 63-68.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Franco Ferracuti
1967 The Subculture of Violence. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Wood, Arthur Lewis
1961 "Crime and Aggression in Changing Ceylon," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, News Series, Vol. 51, Part 8 (December).

Wood, A. L.
1961 "A Socio-Structural Analysis of Murder, Suicide and Economic Crime in Ceylon," American Sociological Review, 26: 213-216.

# APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

TABLE 49

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Age Unreciprocity | | | | High Age Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 23.3 | 35.5 | 48.9 | 47 | 61.4 | 63.6 | 84.2 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 76.7 | 64.5 | 51.1 | 89 | 38.6 | 36.4 | 15.8 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 60 | 31 | 45 | 136 | 44 | 22 | 38 | 104 |
| | $V = .2339$<br>$X^2 = 7.441$<br>$P < .02$ | | | | $V = .2333$<br>$X^2 = 5.660$<br>$P < .05$ | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 26.1 | 20.0 | 82.6 | 47 | 51.0 | 89.7 | 87.5 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 73.9 | 80.0 | 17.4 | 89 | 49.0 | 10.3 | 12.5 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 88 | 25 | 23 | 136 | 29 | 29 | 24 | 104 |
| | $V = .4585$<br>$X^2 = 28.584$<br>$P < .0000$ | | | | $V = .4124$<br>$X^2 = 17.683$<br>$P < .001$ | | | |
| 3. Occupational | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 27.4 | 48.4 | 60.0 | 47 | 64.2 | 74.2 | 80.0 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 72.6 | 51.6 | 40.0 | 89 | 35.8 | 25.8 | 20.0 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 95 | 31 | 10 | 136 | 53 | 31 | 20 | 104 |
| | $V = .0853$<br>$X^2 = .991$<br>$P$ N.S. | | | | $V = .3373$<br>$X^2 = 11.830$<br>$P < .002$ | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 22.0 | 38.1 | 79.2 | 47 | 43.6 | 77.3 | 90.7 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 78.0 | 61.9 | 20.8 | 89 | 56.4 | 22.7 | 9.3 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 91 | 21 | 24 | 136 | 91 | 21 | 24 | 104 |
| | $V$ = .4505 | | | | $V$ = .4637 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 27.601 | | | | $X^2$ = 22.360 | | | |
| | $P$ < .0000 | | | | $P$ < .0000 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 34.5 | 26.7 | 45.5 | 47 | 59.4 | 84.6 | 95.5 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 65.5 | 73.3 | 54.5 | 89 | 40.6 | 15.4 | 4.5 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 110 | 15 | 11 | 136 | 69 | 13 | 22 | 104 |
| | $V$ = .0853 | | | | $V$ = .3373 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .991 | | | | $X^2$ = 11.830 | | | |
| | $P$ N.S. | | | | $P$ < .002 | | | |

TABLE 50

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Age Unreciprocity | | | | High Age Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 71.4 | 63.6 | 49.1 | 30 | 55.6 | 50.0 | 28.1 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 28.6 | 36.4 | 40.9 | 17 | 44.4 | 50.0 | 71.9 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 14 | 11 | 22 | 47 | 27 | 14 | 32 | 73 |
| | $V$ = .1096 | | | | $V$ = .2594 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .5643 | | | | $X^2$ = 4.912 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 60.9 | 40.0 | 73.7 | 30 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 71.4 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 39.1 | 60.0 | 26.3 | 17 | 76.9 | 61.5 | 28.6 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 23 | 5 | 19 | 47 | 26 | 26 | 21 | 73 |
| | $V$ = .2122 | | | | $V$ = .3949 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 2.116 | | | | $X^2$ = 11.381 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .003 | | | |
| 3. Occupational | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 50.0 | 73.3 | 100.0 | 30 | 26.5 | 60.9 | 50.0 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 50.0 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 17 | 73.5 | 39.1 | 50.0 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 26 | 15 | 6 | 47 | 34 | 23 | 16 | 73 |
| | $V$ = .3615 | | | | $V$ = .3123 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 6.141 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.121 | | | |
| | P < .04 | | | | P < .02 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 80.0 | 62.5 | 47.4 | 30 | 52.9 | 64.7 | 28.2 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 20.0 | 37.5 | 52.6 | 17 | 47.1 | 35.3 | 71.8 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 20 | 8 | 19 | 47 | 17 | 17 | 39 | 73 |
| | $V$ = .3095 | | | | $V$ = .3195 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 4.501 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.451 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .02 | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 76.3 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 30 | 53.7 | 36.4 | 23.8 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 23.7 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 17 | 46.3 | 63.6 | 76.2 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 38 | 4 | 5 | 47 | 41 | 11 | 21 | 73 |
| | $V$ = .5416 | | | | $V$ = .2685 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 13.786 | | | | $X^2$ = 5.262 | | | |
| | P < .001 | | | | P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 51

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Education Unreciprocity | | | | High Education Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 42.7 | 54.5 | 69.8 | 77 | 31.0 | 35.0 | 50.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 57.3 | 45.5 | 30.2 | 94 | 69.0 | 65.0 | 50.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 75 | 33 | 63 | 171 | 29 | 20 | 20 | 69 |
| | $V$ = .2444 | | | | $V$ = .1659 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 10.218 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.899 | | | |
| | P < .006 | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 36.9 | 60.4 | 87.2 | 94 | 32.7 | 33.3 | 75.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 63.1 | 39.6 | 12.8 | 77 | 67.3 | 66.7 | 25.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 84 | 48 | 39 | 171 | 55 | 6 | 8 | 69 |
| | $V$ = .4046 | | | | $V$ = .2789 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 27.996 | | | | $X^2$ = 5.368 | | | |
| | P < .0000 | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupational | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 42.7 | 70.2 | 81.0 | 94 | 35.6 | 33.3 | 55.6 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 57.3 | 29.8 | 19.0 | 77 | 64.4 | 66.7 | 44.4 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 103 | 47 | 21 | 171 | 45 | 15 | 9 | 69 |
| | $V$ = .3095 | | | | $V$ = .1441 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 16.385 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.432 | | | |
| | P < .0003 | | | | P N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 33.7 | 64.3 | 85.2 | 94 | 17.1 | 46.7 | 92.3 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 66.3 | 35.7 | 14.8 | 77 | 82.9 | 53.3 | 7.7 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 89 | 28 | 45 | 171 | 41 | 15 | 13 | 69 |
| | $V = .4661$<br>$X^2 = 37.153$<br>$P < .0000$ | | | | $V = .5953$<br>$X^2 = 24.451$<br>$P < .0000$ | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 48.0 | 60.0 | 82.1 | 94 | 35.7 | 37.5 | 60.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 52.0 | 40.0 | 17.9 | 77 | 64.3 | 62.5 | 40.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 123 | 20 | 28 | 171 | 56 | 8 | 5 | 69 |
| | $V = .2536$<br>$X^2 = 10.993$<br>$P < .004$ | | | | $V = .1293$<br>$X^2 = 1.153$<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 52

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION IN PERCENTS

| | Low Education Unreciprocity | | | | High Education Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 59.4 | 50.0 | 36.4 | 44 | 66.7 | 71.4 | 60.0 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 40.6 | 50.0 | 63.6 | 50 | 33.3 | 28.6 | 40.0 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 32 | 81 | 44 | 94 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 26 |
| | $V_2$ = .2071 | | | | $V_2$ = .0976 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 4.031 | | | | $X^2$ = .248 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 29.0 | 37.9 | 70.6 | 44 | 61.1 | 50.0 | 83.3 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 71.0 | 62.1 | 29.4 | 50 | 38.9 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 31 | 29 | 34 | 94 | 18 | 2 | 6 | 26 |
| | $V_2$ = .3657 | | | | $V_2$ = .2156 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 12.574 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.208 | | | |
| | P < .001 | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 29.5 | 60.6 | 64.7 | 44 | 56.2 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 70.5 | 39.4 | 35.3 | 50 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 44 | 33 | 17 | 94 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 26 |
| | $V_2$ = .3258 | | | | $V_2$ = .3563 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 9.977 | | | | $X^2$ = 3.301 | | | |
| | P < .006 | | | | P N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 66.7 | 55.6 | 30.4 | 44 | 71.4 | 85.7 | 50.0 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 33.3 | 44.4 | 69.6 | 50 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 50.0 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 30 | 18 | 46 | 94 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 26 |
| | $V_2$ = .3303 | | | | V = .3190 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 10.258 | | | | $X^2$ = 2.646 | | | |
| | P < .005 | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 61.0 | 25.0 | 21.7 | 44 | 75.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 39.0 | 75.0 | 78.3 | 50 | 25.0 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 59 | 21 | 23 | 94 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| | $V_2$ = .3702 | | | | V = .3690 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 12.882 | | | | $X^2$ = 3.540 | | | |
| | P < .001 | | | | P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 53

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION, IN PERCENTS

| | High Occupation Unreciprocity | | | | Low Occupation Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 33.3 | 50.0 | 65.0 | 31 | 41.9 | 45.9 | 65.1 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 66.7 | 50.0 | 35.0 | 35 | 58.1 | 54.1 | 34.9 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 30 | 16 | 20 | 66 | 74 | 37 | 63 | 174 |
| | V = .2121 | | | | V = .2122 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 4.909 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.832 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .01 | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 39.6 | 63.6 | 71.4 | 31 | 33.0 | 55.8 | 87.5 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 60.4 | 36.4 | 28.6 | 35 | 67.0 | 44.2 | 12.5 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 48 | 11 | 7 | 66 | 91 | 43 | 40 | 174 |
| | V = .2449 | | | | V = .4392 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.959 | | | | $X^2$ = 33.568 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0000 | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 43.2 | 62.5 | 33.3 | 31 | 39.4 | 60.9 | 83.3 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 56.8 | 37.5 | 66.7 | 35 | 60.6 | 39.1 | 16.7 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 44 | 16 | 6 | 66 | 104 | 46 | 24 | 174 |
| | V = .1847 | | | | V = .3163 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 2.251 | | | | $X^2$ = 17.412 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0002 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 27.8 | 35.7 | 100.0 | 31 | 28.7 | 69.0 | 82.4 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 72.2 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 35 | 71.3 | 31.0 | 17.6 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 36 | 14 | 16 | 66 | 94 | 29 | 51 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .6043 | | | | $V$ = .4941 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 24.100 | | | | $X^2$ = 42.477 | | | |
| | $P <$ .0000 | | | | $P <$ .0000 | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 48.1 | 40.0 | 50.0 | 31 | 42.5 | 61.1 | 82.8 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 51.9 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 35 | 57.5 | 38.9 | 17.2 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 52 | 10 | 4 | 66 | 127 | 18 | 29 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .0597 | | | | $V$ = .3042 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .235 | | | | $X^2$ = 16.096 | | | |
| | $P$ N.S. | | | | $P <$ .0003 | | | |

TABLE 54

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION, IN PERCENTS

| | High Occupation Unreciprocity | | | | Low Occupation Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 60.0 | 87.5 | 38.5 | 18 | 61.3 | 41.2 | 41.5 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 40.0 | 12.5 | 61.5 | 13 | 38.7 | 58.8 | 58.5 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 10 | 8 | 13 | 31 | 31 | 17 | 41 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .3981 | | | | $V$ = .1899 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 4.914 | | | | $X^2$ = 3.208 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 57.9 | 57.1 | 60.0 | 18 | 30.0 | 33.3 | 74.3 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 42.1 | 42.9 | 40.0 | 13 | 70.0 | 66.7 | 25.7 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 19 | 7 | 5 | 31 | 30 | 24 | 35 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .0183 | | | | $V$ = .4192 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .010 | | | | $X^2$ = 15.640 | | | |
| | P > N.S. | | | | P < .0004 | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 52.6 | 70.0 | 50.0 | 18 | 29.3 | 64.3 | 65.0 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 47.4 | 30.0 | 50.0 | 13 | 70.7 | 35.7 | 35.0 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 19 | 10 | 2 | 31 | 41 | 28 | 20 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .1674 | | | | $V$ = .3523 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .869 | | | | $X^2$ = 11.046 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .004 | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 70.0 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 18 | 66.7 | 55.0 | 33.3 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 30.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 13 | 33.3 | 45.0 | 66.7 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 10 | 5 | 16 | 31 | 27 | 20 | 42 | 89 |
| | $V_2$ = .4743 | | | | V = .2956 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 6.975 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.774 | | | |
| | P < .03 | | | | P < .02 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 68.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 18 | 63.0 | 27.3 | 25.0 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 32.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 13 | 37.0 | 72.7 | 75.0 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 25 | 4 | 2 | 31 | 54 | 11 | 24 | 89 |
| | V = .4242 | | | | V = .3644 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 5.579 | | | | $X^2$ = 11.815 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .002 | | | |

TABLE 55

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES,

WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS, IN PERCENTS

| | Married Unreciprocity | | | | Single Unreciprocity | | | | Divorced, Widowed, Separated Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 43.3 | 50.0 | 73.7 | 35 | 17.9 | 33.3 | 46.7 | 25 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 76.5 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 56.7 | 50.0 | 26.3 | 30 | 82.1 | 66.7 | 53.3 | 51 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 23.5 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 30 | 16 | 19 | 65 | 28 | 18 | 30 | 76 | 46 | 18 | | 98 |
| | $V = .2613$ | | | | $V = .2677$ | | | | $V = .2457$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 4.438$ | | | | $X^2 = 5.448$ | | | | $X^2 = 5.916$ | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | | P $< .05$ | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 40.5 | 71.4 | 88.9 | 35 | 10.3 | 31.6 | 83.3 | 25 | 84.3 | 70.0 | 85.0 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 59.5 | 28.6 | 11.1 | 30 | 89.7 | 68.4 | 16.7 | 51 | 51.7 | 30.0 | 15.0 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 42 | 14 | 9 | 65 | 39 | 19 | 18 | 76 | 58 | 20 | 20 | 98 |
| | $V = .3764$ | | | | $V = .6263$ | | | | $V = .3093$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 9.210$ | | | | $X^2 = 29.815$ | | | | $X^2 = 9.378$ | | | |
| | P $< .01$ | | | | P $< .0000$ | | | | P $< .009$ | | | |

3. Occupation

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 46.3 | 61.5 | 72.7 | 35 | 18.9 | 50.0 | 88.9 | 25 | 56.6 | 65.7 | 60.0 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 53.7 | 38.5 | 27.3 | 30 | 81.1 | 50.0 | 11.1 | 51 | 43.4 | 34.3 | 40.0 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 41 | 13 | 11 | 65 | 53 | 14 | 9 | 76 | 53 | 35 | 10 | 98 |
| | V = .2082 | | | | V = .5048 | | | | V = .0863 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 2.817 | | | | $X^2$ = 19.363 | | | | $X^2$ = .7305 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0001 | | | | P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 30.3 | 57.1 | 94.4 | 35 | 25.8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 25 | 32.3 | 52.4 | 82.6 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 69.7 | 42.9 | 5.6 | 30 | 74.2 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 51 | 67.7 | 47.6 | 17.4 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 33 | 14 | 18 | 65 | 66 | 8 | 2 | 76 | 31 | 21 | 46 | 98 |
| | V = .5457 | | | | V = .3978 | | | | V = .4549 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 19.359 | | | | $X^2$ = 12.028 | | | | $X^2$ = 20.279 | | | |
| | P < .0001 | | | | P < .002 | | | | P < .0000 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 48.1 | 75.0 | 85.7 | 35 | 32.1 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 25 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 88.9 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 51.9 | 25.0 | 14.3 | 30 | 67.9 | 75.0 | 50.0 | 51 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 11.1 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 54 | 4 | 7 | 56 | 56 | 12 | 8 | 76 | 68 | 12 | 18 | 98 |
| | V = .2568 | | | | V = .1364 | | | | V = .3232 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 4.286 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.414 | | | | $X^2$ = 10.233 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | | P < .006 | | | |

TABLE 56

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS, IN PERCENTS

| | Married Unreciprocity | | | | Single Unreciprocity | | | | Divorced, Widowed, Separated Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 53.8 | 50.0 | 64.3 | 20 | 80.0 | 83.3 | 35.7 | 14 | 60.9 | 40.0 | 30.8 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 46.2 | 50.0 | 35.7 | 15 | 20.9 | 16.7 | 64.3 | 11 | 39.1 | 60.0 | 69.2 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 13 | 8 | 14 | 35 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 25 | 23 | 10 | 26 | 59 |
| | $V = .1214$ | | | | $V = .4616$ | | | | $V = .2782$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = .516$ | | | | $X^2 = 5.326$ | | | | $X^2 = 4.567$ | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 47.1 | 50.0 | 87.5 | 20 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 80.0 | 14 | 39.3 | 35.7 | 58.8 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 52.9 | 50.0 | 12.5 | 15 | 75.0 | 83.3 | 20.0 | 11 | 60.7 | 64.3 | 41.2 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 17 | 10 | 8 | 35 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 25 | 28 | 14 | 17 | 59 |
| | $V = .3349$ | | | | $V = .5944$ | | | | $V = .1913$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 3.925$ | | | | $X^2 = 8.834$ | | | | $X^2 = 2.158$ | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P $< .01$ | | | | P N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 52.6 | 25.0 | 37.5 | 20 | 30.0 | 57.1 | 87.5 | 14 | 30.0 | 65.2 | 33.3 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 47.4 | 75.0 | 62.5 | 15 | 70.0 | 42.9 | 12.5 | 11 | 70.0 | 34.8 | 66.7 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 19 | 8 | 8 | 35 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 25 | 30 | 23 | 6 | 59 |
| | $V$ = .2316<br>$X^2$ = 1.877<br>P N.S. | | | | $V$ = .4886<br>$X^2$ = 5.969<br>P < .05 | | | | $V$ = .3411<br>$X^2$ = 6.863<br>P < .03 | | | |
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 80.0 | 100.0 | 23.5 | 20 | 64.7 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 14 | 60.0 | 45.5 | 39.5 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 20.0 | 0.0 | 76.5 | 15 | 35.3 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 11 | 40.0 | 54.5 | 60.5 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 10 | 8 | 17 | 35 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 25 | 10 | 11 | 38 | 59 |
| | $V$ = .6756<br>$X^2$ = 15.976<br>P < .0003 | | | | $V$ = .3553<br>$X^2$ = 3.156<br>P N.S. | | | | $V$ = .1520<br>$X^2$ = 1.364<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 69.2 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 20 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14 | 52.9 | 33.3 | 31.3 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 30.8 | 66.7 | 83.3 | 15 | 22.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 11 | 47.1 | 66.7 | 68.8 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 26 | 3 | 6 | 35 | 18 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 34 | 9 | 16 | 59 |
| | $V$ = .4229<br>$X^2$ = 6.260<br>P < .04 | | | | $V$ = .7035<br>$X^2$ = 12.374<br>P < .002 | | | | $V$ = .2088<br>$X2$ = 2.573<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 57

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE, IN PERCENTS

| | White Unreciprocity | | | | Non-White Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 33.3 | 39.1 | 54.3 | 45 | 45.3 | 53.3 | 72.9 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 66.7 | 60.9 | 45.7 | 64 | 54.7 | 46.7 | 27.1 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 51 | 23 | 35 | 109 | 53 | 30 | 48 | 131 |
| | $V_2$ = .1871 | | | | $V_2$ = .2487 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.815 | | | | $X^2$ = 8.103 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .01 | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 31.1 | 42.1 | 87.5 | 45 | 40.0 | 65.7 | 83.9 | 56 |
| Non-Violent | 68.9 | 57.9 | 12.5 | 64 | 60.0 | 34.3 | 16.1 | 75 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 74 | 19 | 16 | 109 | 65 | 35 | 31 | 131 |
| | $V_2$ = .3982 | | | | $V_2$ = .3697 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 17.281 | | | | $X^2$ = 17.904 | | | |
| | P < .0002 | | | | P < .0001 | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 29.2 | 54.8 | 69.2 | 45 | 49.4 | 67.7 | 76.5 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 70.8 | 45.2 | 30.8 | 64 | 50.6 | 32.3 | 23.5 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 65 | 31 | 13 | 109 | 83 | 31 | 17 | 131 |
| | $V_2$ = .3094 | | | | $V_2$ = .2149 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 10.434 | | | | $X^2$ = 6.052 | | | |
| | P < .005 | | | | P < .04 | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 25.4 | 35.0 | 76.7 | 45 | 31.0 | 78.3 | 94.6 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 74.6 | 65.0 | 23.3 | 64 | 69.0 | 21.7 | 5.4 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 59 | 20 | 30 | 109 | 71 | 23 | 37 | 131 |
| | $V_2$ = .4487 | | | | $V_2$ = .5877 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 21.942 | | | | $X^2$ = 45.244 | | | |
| | P < .0000 | | | | P < .0000 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 36.0 | 60.0 | 70.0 | 45 | 52.2 | 50.0 | 82.6 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 64.0 | 40.0 | 30.0 | 64 | 47.8 | 50.0 | 17.4 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 89 | 10 | 10 | 109 | 90 | 18 | 23 | 131 |
| | $V_2$ = .2325 | | | | $V_2$ = .2370 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 5.890 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.359 | | | |
| | P < .05 | | | | P < .02 | | | |

TABLE 58

DEGREE OF UNRECIPROCITY FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE, IN PERCENTS

| | White Unreciprocity | | | | Non-White Unreciprocity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 52.9 | 77.8 | 57.9 | 27 | 66.7 | 43.8 | 31.4 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 47.1 | 22.2 | 42.1 | 18 | 33.3 | 56.2 | 68.6 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 17 | 9 | 19 | 45 | 24 | 16 | 35 | 75 |
| | $V$ = .1870<br>$X^2$ = 1.573<br>P N.S. | | | | $V$ = .3089<br>$X^2$ = 7.154<br>P < .02 | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 43.5 | 50.0 | 92.9 | 27 | 38.5 | 34.8 | 61.5 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 56.5 | 50.0 | 7.1 | 18 | 61.5 | 65.2 | 38.5 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 23 | 8 | 41 | 45 | 26 | 23 | 26 | 75 |
| | $V$ = .4533<br>$X^2$ = 9.247<br>P < .009 | | | | $V$ = .2390<br>$X^2$ = 4.284<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 36.8 | 76.5 | 77.8 | 27 | 36.6 | 57.1 | 53.8 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 63.2 | 23.5 | 22.2 | 18 | 63.4 | 42.9 | 46.2 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 19 | 17 | 9 | 45 | 41 | 21 | 13 | 74 |
| | $V$ = .4042<br>$X^2$ = 7.352<br>P < .02 | | | | $V$ = .1942<br>$X^2$ = 2.828<br>P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 73.3 | 85.7 | 43.5 | 27 | 63.6 | 55.6 | 28.6 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 26.7 | 14.3 | 56.5 | 18 | 36.4 | 44.4 | 71.4 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 15 | 7 | 23 | 45 | 22 | 18 | 35 | 75 |
| | $V_2$ = .3545 | | | | $V_2$ = .3204 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 5.656 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.701 | | | |
| | P < .05 | | | | P < .02 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 71.9 | 33.3 | 28.6 | 27 | 59.6 | 22.2 | 21.1 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 28.1 | 66.7 | 71.4 | 18 | 40.4 | 77.8 | 78.9 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 32 | 6 | 7 | 47 | 47 | 9 | 19 | 75 |
| | $V$ = .3812 | | | | $V$ = .3707 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 6.539 | | | | $X^2$ = 10.306 | | | |
| | P < .03 | | | | P < .005 | | | |

TABLE 59

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Age Loss | | | | High Age Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 28.8 | 36.4 | 46.7 | 47 | 54.5 | 100.0 | 17.6 | 31 |
| Non-Violent | 71.2 | 63.6 | 53.3 | 89 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 82.4 | 73 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 73 | 33 | 30 | 136 | 55 | 15 | 34 | 104 |
| | $V_2$ = .1504 | | | | $V_2$ = .3824 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.075 | | | | $X^2$ = 15.209 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0005 | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 26.5 | 24.1 | 69.0 | 47 | 52.2 | 60.0 | 84.3 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 73.5 | 75.9 | 31.0 | 89 | 47.8 | 40.0 | 15.7 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 49 | 58 | 29 | 136 | 23 | 30 | 51 | 104 |
| | $V_2$ = .3773 | | | | $V_2$ = .3088 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 19.362 | | | | $X^2$ = 9.919 | | | |
| | P < .001 | | | | P < .007 | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 33.6 | 62.5 | 27.8 | 47 | 67.9 | 66.7 | 82.4 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 66.4 | 37.5 | 72.2 | 89 | 32.1 | 33.3 | 17.6 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 110 | 8 | 18 | 136 | 81 | 6 | 17 | 104 |
| | $V_2$ = .1527 | | | | $V_2$ = .1177 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.169 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.440 | | | |
| | P N.S | | | | P / N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 34.5 | 25.0 | 60.0 | 47 | 58.9 | 84.4 | 81.2 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 65.5 | 75.0 | 40.0 | 89 | 41.1 | 15.6 | 18.8 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 119 | 12 | 5 | 136 | 56 | 32 | 16 | 104 |
| | $V_2$ = .1187 | | | | $V_2$ = .2669 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.916 | | | | $X^2$ = 7.407 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .02 | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 33.6 | 40.0 | 66.7 | 47 | 68.9 | 85.7 | 71.4 | 73 |
| Non-Violent | 66.4 | 60.0 | 33.3 | 89 | 31.1 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 31 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 128 | 5 | 3 | 136 | 90 | 7 | 7 | 104 |
| | V = .1045 | | | | V = .8843 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.486 | | | | $X^2$ = .884 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 60

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR AGE, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Age Loss | | | | High Age Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 76.2 | 50.0 | 57.1 | 30 | 50.0 | 26.7 | 42.9 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 23.8 | 50.0 | 42.9 | 17 | 50.0 | 73.3 | 57.1 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 21 | 12 | 14 | 47 | 30 | 15 | 28 | 73 |
| | $V = .2377$<br>$X^2 = 2.655$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .1748$<br>$X^2 = 2.231$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 76.9 | 64.3 | 55.0 | 30 | 58.3 | 22.2 | 46.5 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 23.1 | 35.7 | 45.0 | 17 | 41.7 | 77.8 | 53.5 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 13 | 14 | 20 | 47 | 12 | 18 | 43 | 73 |
| | $V = .1869$<br>$X^2 = 1.642$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .2495$<br>$X^2 = 4.544$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 56.8 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 30 | 45.5 | 25.0 | 35.7 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 43.2 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 17 | 54.5 | 75.0 | 64.3 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 37 | 5 | 5 | 47 | 55 | 4 | 14 | 73 |
| | $V = .2990$<br>$X^2 = 4.201$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .1148$<br>$X^2 = .962$<br>P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 73.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30 | 57.6 | 37.0 | 15.4 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 26.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 17 | 42.4 | 63.0 | 84.6 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 41 | 3 | 3 | 47 | 33 | 27 | 13 | 73 |
| | $V = .5082$<br>$X^2 = 12.138$<br>$P < .002$ | | | | $V = .3165$<br>$X^2 = 7.312$<br>$P < .02$ | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 69.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30 | 43.5 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 31 |
| Female Homicide | 30.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 17 | 56.5 | 66.7 | 60.0 | 42 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 43 | 2 | 2 | 47 | 62 | 6 | 5 | 73 |
| | $V = .4052$<br>$X^2 = 7.715$<br>$P < .02$ | | | | $V_2 = .0582$<br>$X^2 = .247$<br>$P$ / N.S. | | | |

TABLE 61

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Education Loss | | | | High Education Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 42.0 | 60.0 | 72.0 | 94 | 36.2 | 37.5 | 42.9 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 58.0 | 40.0 | 28.0 | 77 | 63.8 | 62.5 | 57.1 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 81 | 40 | 50 | 171 | 47 | 8 | 14 | 69 |
| | $V = .2626$<br>$X^2 = 11.793$<br>$P < .002$ | | | | $V = .0546$<br>$X^2 = 2.055$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 25.0 | 38.7 | 78.9 | 94 | 38.5 | 23.1 | 75.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 75.0 | 61.3 | 21.1 | 77 | 61.5 | 76.9 | 25.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 20 | 75 | 76 | 171 | 52 | 13 | 4 | 69 |
| | $V = .4391$<br>$X^2 = 32.963$<br>$P < .0000$ | | | | $V = .2274$<br>$X^2 = 3.567$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 51.8 | 80.0 | 62.5 | 94 | 38.9 | 25.0 | 36.4 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 48.2 | 20.0 | 37.5 | 77 | 61.1 | 75.0 | 63.6 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 137 | 10 | 24 | 171 | 54 | 4 | 11 | 69 |
| | $V = .1457$<br>$X^2 = 3.628$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .0676$<br>$X^2 = .316$<br>P N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 47.6 | 71.0 | 81.2 | 94 | 29.4 | 61.5 | 60.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 52.4 | 29.0 | 18.8 | 77 | 70.6 | 38.5 | 40.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 124 | 31 | 16 | 171 | 51 | 13 | 5 | 69 |
| | $V = .2467$<br>$X^2 = 10.405$<br>$P < .005$ | | | | $V = .2873$<br>$X^2 = 5.697$<br>$P < .05$ | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 53.8 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 94 | 33.9 | 66.7 | 75.0 | 26 |
| Non-Violent | 46.2 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 77 | 66.1 | 33.3 | 25.0 | 43 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 156 | 9 | 6 | 171 | 62 | 62 | 4 | 69 |
| | $V = .0729$<br>$X^2 = .909$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .2356$<br>$X^2 = 3.829$<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 62

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR EDUCATION, IN PERCENTS

| | Low Education Loss | | | | High Education Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 55.9 | 37.5 | 44.4 | 44 | 70.6 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 44.1 | 62.5 | 55.6 | 50 | 29.4 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 34 | 24 | 36 | 94 | 17 | 3 | 6 | 26 |
| | $V$ = .1473 | | | | $V$ = .2457 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 2.040 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.569 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 60.0 | 41.4 | 48.3 | 44 | 70.0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 40.0 | 58.6 | 51.7 | 50 | 30.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 5 | 29 | 60 | 94 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
| | $V$ = .0893 | | | | $V$ = .2443 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .749 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.552 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 46.5 | 62.5 | 40.0 | 44 | 61.9 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 53.5 | 37.5 | 60.0 | 50 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 71 | 8 | 15 | 94 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 26 |
| | $V$ = .1069 | | | | $V$ = .1760 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.074 | | | | $X^2$ = .805 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 61.0 | 31.8 | 7.7 | 44 | 86.7 | 37.5 | 33.3 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 39.0 | 68.2 | 92.3 | 50 | 13.3 | 62.5 | 66.7 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 59 | 22 | 13 | 94 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 26 |
| | $V = .3962$ | | | | $V = .5230$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 14.758$ | | | | $X^2 = 7.112$ | | | |
| | $P < .0006$ | | | | $P < .02$ | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 51.2 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 44 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 66.7 | 17 |
| Female Homicide | 48.8 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 50 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 9 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 84 | 6 | 4 | 94 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 26 |
| | $V = .2601$ | | | | $V = .0934$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 6.357$ | | | | $X = .227$ | | | |
| | $P < .04$ | | | | $P /$ N.S. | | | |

TABLE 63

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION, IN PERCENTS

| | High Occupation Loss | | | | Low Occupation Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 40.0 | 80.0 | 45.5 | 31 | 39.8 | 50.0 | 69.8 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 60.0 | 20.0 | 55.5 | 35 | 60.2 | 50.0 | 30.2 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 45 | 10 | 11 | 66 | 83 | 38 | 53 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .2825 | | | | $V$ = .2595 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 5.268 | | | | $X^2$ = 11.717 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .002 | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 47.1 | 40.0 | 58.3 | 31 | 23.7 | 35.3 | 82.4 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 52.9 | 60.0 | 41.7 | 35 | 76.3 | 64.7 | 17.6 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 34 | 20 | 12 | 66 | 38 | 68 | 68 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .1238 | | | | $V$ = .5075 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.012 | | | | $X^2$ = 44.811 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0000 | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 47.4 | 50.0 | 42.9 | 31 | 48.5 | 66.7 | 57.1 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 52.6 | 50.0 | 57.1 | 35 | 51.5 | 33.3 | 42.9 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 57 | 2 | 7 | 66 | 134 | 12 | 28 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .0298 | | | | $V$ = .1054 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .059 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.933 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 39.6 | 70.0 | 62.5 | 31 | 43.3 | 67.6 | 84.6 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 60.4 | 30.0 | 37.5 | 35 | 56.7 | 32.4 | 15.4 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 48 | 10 | 8 | 66 | 127 | 34 | 13 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .2448 | | | | $V$ = .2697 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.955 | | | | $X^2$ = 12.656 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .001 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide | 44.1 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 31 | 49.7 | 55.6 | 83.3 | 89 |
| Non-Violent | 55.9 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 35 | 50.3 | 44.4 | 16.7 | 85 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 59 | 3 | 4 | 66 | 159 | 9 | 6 | 174 |
| | $V$ = .2336 | | | | $V$ = .1244 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.601 | | | | $X^2$ = 2.694 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 64

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR OCCUPATION, IN PERCENTS

| | High Occupation Loss | | | | Low Occupation Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 55.6 | 50.0 | 80.0 | 18 | 63.6 | 31.6 | 43.2 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 44.4 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 13 | 36.4 | 68.4 | 56.8 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 18 | 8 | 5 | 31 | 33 | 19 | 37 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .2007 | | | | $V$ = .2512 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.248 | | | | $X^2$ = 5.614 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 62.5 | 62.5 | 42.9 | 18 | 77.8 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 37.5 | 37.5 | 57.1 | 13 | 22.2 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 16 | 8 | 7 | 31 | 9 | 24 | 56 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .1664 | | | | $V$ = .2452 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = .859 | | | | $X^2$ = 5.349 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 59.3 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 18 | 46.2 | 62.5 | 50.0 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 40.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 13 | 53.8 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 27 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 65 | 8 | 16 | 89 |
| | $V$ = .2194 | | | | $V$ = .0939 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 1.492 | | | | $X^2$ = .784 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 78.9 | 28.6 | 20.0 | 18 | 61.8 | 34.8 | 9.1 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 21.1 | 71.4 | 80.0 | 13 | 38.2 | 65.2 | 90.9 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 19 | 7 | 5 | 31 | 55 | 23 | 11 | 89 |
| | $V = .5352$<br>$X^2 = 8.879$<br>$P < .01$ | | | | $V = .3745$<br>$X^2 = 12.480$<br>$P < .002$ | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 61.5 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 18 | 51.9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 43 |
| Female Homicide | 38.5 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 13 | 48.1 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 46 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 26 | 3 | 2 | 31 | 79 | 5 | 5 | 89 |
| | $V = .1738$<br>$X^2 = .936$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .2016$<br>$X^2 = 3.617$<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 65

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES,

WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS, IN PERCENTS

| | Married Loss | | | | Single Loss | | | | Divorced, Widowed, Separated Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 40.0 | 58.3 | 92.3 | 35 | 24.3 | 35.3 | 45.5 | 25 | 51.0 | 73.7 | 67.9 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 60.0 | 41.7 | 7.7 | 30 | 75.7 | 64.7 | 54.5 | 51 | 49.0 | 26.3 | 32.1 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 40 | 12 | 13 | 65 | 37 | 17 | 22 | 76 | 51 | 19 | 28 | 98 |
| | $V = .4099$<br>$X^2 = 10.921$<br>$P < .004$ | | | | $V = .1936$<br>$X^2 = 2.848$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .2004$<br>$X^2 = 3.937$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 31.3 | 51.7 | 75.0 | 35 | 8.3 | 15.6 | 90.0 | 25 | 56.3 | 42.3 | 75.0 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 68.8 | 48.3 | 25.0 | 30 | 91.7 | 84.4 | 10.0 | 51 | 43.7 | 57.7 | 25.0 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 16 | 29 | 20 | 65 | 24 | 32 | 20 | 76 | 32 | 26 | 40 | 98 |
| | $V = .3268$<br>$X^2 = 6.941$<br>$P < .03$ | | | | $V = .7294$<br>$X^2 = 40.429$<br>$P < .0000$ | | | | $V = .2737$<br>$X^2 = 7.339$<br>$P < .02$ | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 51.9 | 66.7 | 60.0 | 35 | 28.3 | 60.0 | 45.5 | 25 | 60.3 | 66.7 | 57.1 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 48.1 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 30 | 71.7 | 40.0 | 54.5 | 51 | 39.7 | 33.3 | 42.9 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 52 | 3 | 10 | 65 | 60 | 5 | 11 | 76 | 78 | 6 | 14 | 98 |
| | V = .0812<br>$X^2$ = .428<br>P N.S. | | | | V = .1992<br>$X^2$ = 3.016<br>P N.S. | | | | V = .0403<br>$X^2$ = .159<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 48.1 | 75.0 | 80.0 | 35 | 30.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25 | 53.1 | 65.7 | 71.4 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 51.9 | 25.0 | 20.0 | 30 | 69.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51 | 46.9 | 34.3 | 28.6 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 52 | 8 | 5 | 65 | 73 | 1 | 2 | 76 | 49 | 35 | 14 | 98 |
| | V = .2325<br>$X^2$ = 3.513<br>P N.S. | | | | V = .2895<br>$X^2$ = 6.372<br>P < .04 | | | | V = .1506<br>$X^2$ = 2.223<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 51.7 | 66.7 | 75.0 | 35 | 33.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25 | 47.6 | 85.7 | 66.7 | 59 |
| Non-Violent | 48.3 | 33.3 | 25.0 | 30 | 66.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 51 | 42.4 | 14.3 | 33.3 | 39 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 58 | 3 | 4 | 65 | 74 | 2 | 0 | 76 | 85 | 7 | 6 | 98 |
| | V = .1255<br>$X^2$ = 1.024<br>P N.S. | | | | V = .0276<br>$X^2$ = .058<br>P N.S. | | | | V = .1511<br>$X^2$ = 2.238<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 66

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR MARITAL STATUS, IN PERCENTS

| | Married Loss | | | | Single Loss | | | | Divorced, Widowed, Separated Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 62.5 | 57.1 | 50.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 30.0 | 14 | 46.2 | 28.6 | 52.6 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 37.5 | 42.9 | 50.0 | 15 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 70.0 | 11 | 53.8 | 71.4 | 47.4 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 16 | 7 | 12 | 35 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 25 | 26 | 14 | 19 | 59 |
| | $V = .1118$<br>$X^2 = .438$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .6653$<br>$X^2 = 11.066$<br>$P < .004$ | | | | $V = .1830$<br>$X^2 = 1.975$<br>P N.S. | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 80.0 | 40.0 | 66.7 | 20 | 50.0 | 60.0 | 55.6 | 14 | 66.7 | 27.3 | 36.7 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 20.0 | 60.0 | 33.3 | 15 | 50.0 | 40.0 | 44.4 | 11 | 33.3 | 72.7 | 63.3 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 5 | 15 | 15 | 35 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 25 | 18 | 11 | 30 | 59 |
| | $V = .3127$<br>$X^2 = 3.422$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .0502$<br>$X^2 = .0631$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .3096$<br>$X^2 = 5.655$<br>$P < .05$ | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mate Homicide | 63.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 20 | 58.8 | 66.7 | 40.0 | 14 | 38.3 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 37.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 15 | 41.2 | 33.3 | 60.0 | 11 | 61.7 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 27 | 2 | 6 | 35 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 25 | 47 | 4 | 8 | 59 |
| | $V = .3007$<br>$X^2 = 3.165$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .1689$<br>$X^2 = .713$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .3142$<br>$X^2 = 5.826$<br>$P < .05$ | | | |
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 72.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 20 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14 | 61.5 | 34.8 | 20.0 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 28.0 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 15 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 11 | 38.5 | 65.2 | 80.0 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 25 | 6 | 4 | 35 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 25 | 26 | 23 | 10 | 59 |
| | $V = .5064$<br>$X^2 = 8.976$<br>$P < .01$ | | | | $V = .4166$<br>$X^2 = 4.339$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .3287$<br>$X^2 = 6.374$<br>$P < .04$ | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 60.0 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 20 | 56.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14 | 49.0 | 16.7 | 25.0 | 26 |
| Female Homicide | 40.0 | 50.0 | 66.7 | 15 | 44.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11 | 51.0 | 83.3 | 75.0 | 33 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 30 | 2 | 3 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 49 | 6 | 4 | 59 |
| | $V = .1546$<br>$X^2 = .836$<br>P N.S. | | | | | | | | $V = .2216$<br>$X^2 = 2.897$<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 67

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE HOMICIDE AND NON-VIOLENT SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE, IN PERCENTS

| | White Loss | | | | Non-White Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 31.9 | 52.2 | 64.7 | 45 | 49.2 | 60.0 | 66.0 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 68.1 | 47.8 | 35.3 | 64 | 50.8 | 40.0 | 34.0 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 69 | 23 | 17 | 109 | 59 | 25 | 47 | 131 |
| | $V = .2621$ | | | | $V = .1542$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 7.488$ | | | | $X^2 = 3.114$ | | | |
| | $P < .02$ | | | | P | N.S. | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 36.1 | 35.7 | 54.8 | 45 | 33.3 | 37.0 | 93.9 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 63.9 | 64.3 | 45.2 | 64 | 67.7 | 63.0 | 6.1 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 36 | 42 | 31 | 109 | 36 | 46 | 49 | 131 |
| | $V = .1736$ | | | | $V = .5730$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 3.285$ | | | | $X^2 = 43.014$ | | | |
| | P | N.S. | | | $P < .0000$ | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 38.2 | 57.1 | 53.8 | 45 | 56.9 | 71.4 | 54.5 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 61.8 | 42.9 | 46.2 | 64 | 43.1 | 28.6 | 45.5 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 89 | 7 | 13 | 109 | 102 | 7 | 22 | 131 |
| | $V = .1328$ | | | | $V = .0703$ | | | |
| | $X^2 = 1.921$ | | | | $X^2 = .6470$ | | | |
| | P | N.S. | | | P | N.S. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Mate | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 35.8 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 45 | 47.9 | 83.3 | 76.9 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 64.2 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 64 | 52.1 | 16.7 | 23.1 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 81 | 20 | 8 | 109 | 94 | 24 | 13 | 131 |
| | $V = .2222$<br>$X^2 = 5.382$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .3040$<br>$X^2 = 12.105$<br>$P < .002$ | | | |
| 5. Parental | | | | | | | | |
| Homicide | 38.4 | 60.0 | 80.0 | 45 | 56.3 | 71.4 | 60.0 | 75 |
| Non-Violent | 61.6 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 64 | 43.7 | 28.6 | 40.0 | 56 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 99 | 5 | 5 | 109 | 119 | 7 | 5 | 131 |
| | $V = .195$<br>$X^2 = 4.158$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .0696$<br>$X^2 = .634$<br>P N.S. | | | |

TABLE 68

DEGREE OF LOSS FOR THE MALE HOMICIDE AND FEMALE HOMICIDE SAMPLES, WITH CONTROLS FOR RACE, IN PERCENTS

| | White Loss | | | | Non-White Loss | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High | N | Low | Moderate | High | N |
| 1. Childhood | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 59.1 | 50.0 | 72.7 | 27 | 62.1 | 26.7 | 38.7 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 40.9 | 50.0 | 27.3 | 18 | 37.9 | 73.3 | 61.3 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 22 | 12 | 11 | 45 | 29 | 15 | 31 | 75 |
| | $V = .1667$<br>$X^2 = 1.250$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .2813$<br>$X^2 = 5.935$<br>$P < .05$ | | | |
| 2. Student | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 61.5 | 60.0 | 58.8 | 27 | 75.0 | 23.5 | 45.7 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 38.5 | 40.0 | 41.2 | 18 | 25.0 | 76.5 | 54.3 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 13 | 15 | 17 | 45 | 12 | 17 | 46 | 75 |
| | $V = .0224$<br>$X^2 = .023$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .3168$<br>$X^2 = 7.525$<br>$P < .02$ | | | |
| 3. Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| Male Homicide | 52.9 | 75.0 | 85.7 | 27 | 48.3 | 60.0 | 25.0 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 47.1 | 25.0 | 14.3 | 18 | 51.7 | 40.0 | 75.0 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 34 | 4 | 7 | 45 | 58 | 5 | 12 | 75 |
| | $V = .2773$<br>$X^2 = 3.461$<br>P N.S. | | | | $V = .1474$<br>$X^2 = 1.629$<br>P N.S. | | | |

4. Mate

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 69.0 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 27 | 64.4 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 31.0 | 50.0 | 66.7 | 18 | 35.6 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 29 | 10 | 6 | 45 | 45 | 20 | 10 | 75 |
| | $V$ = .2652 | | | | $V$ = .4934 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.166 | | | | $X^2$ = 18.261 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P < .0001 | | | |

5. Parental

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Homicide | 65.8 | 33.3 | 25.0 | 27 | 47.8 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 34 |
| Female Homicide | 34.2 | 66.7 | 75.0 | 18 | 52.2 | 80.0 | 66.7 | 41 |
| Total Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| TOTAL N | 38 | 3 | 4 | 45 | 67 | 5 | 3 | 75 |
| | $V$ = .2773 | | | | $V$ = .1474 | | | |
| | $X^2$ = 3.461 | | | | $X^2$ = 1.629 | | | |
| | P N.S. | | | | P N.S. | | | |